School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1425215
BT
736.4
C4

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

CHRIST AND PEACE

A Discussion of some
Fundamental Issues
raised by the War

One Shilling net

CHRIST AND PEACE

BT
736.4
C4

CHRIST AND PEACE

A Discussion of Some Fundamental Issues Raised by the War

ESSAYS BY

J. ST. GEORGE HEATH
W. FEARON HALLIDAY
HENRY T. HODGKIN
W. E. ORCHARD
RICHARD ROBERTS
A. MAUDE ROYDEN

EDITED BY JOAN M. FRY

LONDON
HEADLEY BROTHERS
BISHOPSGATE

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

NOTE BY THE EDITOR

THE following essays require but little editorial setting. Seeing that they deal directly and strongly with the burning question of war in relation to the Christian ethic they need no apology, they only need to be read. Originally they were delivered at a gathering of members of various religious organizations who met at Cambridge in the last days of December, 1914, to consider their position as Christians in relation to the present strife.

The papers are now published in the belief that they will be of service to many who are in doubt as to what to think in a time when problems are so acute and grievous that only the highest endeavour may avail to find true solutions. Dr. Hodgkin's plea, in the Introduction, for the right of the Church to speak for peace *now* is based on the need for reality in religion, and it should disarm any possible criticism of the fitness of the time chosen for publication. If the Church is to perform her duty as a guide, it must be done now, or her leadership is worse than useless, it becomes unreal. It is where one false step in the snow may mean death, not in the meadow pathways, that the strong certainty of the mountaineer is necessary to the traveller.

There is no actual organic relation between the essays. They can be read quite independently, if so

desired. Approaching the subject from differing angles their messages will, it is hoped, glance back into many different minds. The economist might begin with Mr. Heath's paper, as starting from ground that is familiar to him, and if some find that Dr. Orchard's exposition from the apocalyptic standpoint is too severe a task in Biblical criticism, let them turn to other essays, where the same truths receive a different setting, as for instance, Miss Royden's, in which the subject is approached largely from the point of view of the New Testament, whilst Mr. Halliday's treatment of it from the philosophical conception of personality will attract minds of quite another order.

At a time when the unthinking are saying that the ideal of peace is impossible, it is, for some, the paramount duty so to think as to make that ideal more real than it ever has been. Yet it is idle to cry for peace without recognising that under that name there lurk issues which are poles apart in their true significance. The peace of sheer exhaustion which only wishes a breathing space before beginning the next round, the peace bought by a nation at the cost of its independent existence, even the peace of many diplomats, is not the same as that so boldly and so finely outlined by Mr. Roberts. It is for the peace of a new world-order, that Christians must ceaselessly work and pray, and it is with the sense of individual duty to help, in however small a degree, towards the attainment of this spiritual order of peace that this book is sent forth.

JOAN MARY FRY.

CONTENTS

PAGE

NOTE BY THE EDITOR - - - 5

INTRODUCTION. HENRY T. HODGKIN, M.A., M.B. - - - - - 11

Peace and War no longer an academic question.—The reality of the struggle is a call to the Church to think and lead.—The true Church being supra-national, should be able to speak disinterestedly.

I. THE QUEST OF CHRISTIAN DUTY IN WAR TIME. RICHARD ROBERTS - 17

Need of real re-adjustment of ideas.—Responsibility for the War very widespread.—Ordinary pacifist position insufficient as against national need.—Conflict of loyalties.—How caused.—Many Churches uphold the war.—War not merely a question of the use of force, but of a world-order which the Church exists to transform.—For what should the Church stand?—For a ministry of reconciliation.—The Church cannot settle international disputes, it should deal with the spirit behind disputes.—The Church's failure.—Two world-orders: one natural, the other spiritual. The Church exists to transform the one into the other.—Ideals of national and international life must be changed.—The Church should have mobilised youth for higher aims.—She should even now stand for a new way of life.

PAGE

II. THE NATURE OF THE CHRISTIAN OBEDIENCE. A. MAUDE ROYDEN 34

Just and unjust wars.—The call to serve the nation. —The call to serve Christ.—Are they incompatible ? —Is compromise the only solution ?—Are Christians to wait to obey until the world is ready to do so too ? —Obedience the only means to surer vision.—Loyalty to Christ the only sure way to loyalty to fellowmen.

III. THE CHRISTIAN BASIS FOR SOCIETY. HENRY T. HODGKIN, M.A., M.B. 45

Love a force which involves : Active good to others, —Imagination of others' position.—Cannot be bounded by nationalities.—Is an overflowing principle of life, not a mere rule.—Application in private life.— National life.—International life. A world adventure needed to meet the present crisis.—Need to revise the idea of God.—Need to trust to spiritual force.

IV. THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS WITHIN YOU. W. E. ORCHARD, D.D. - - 61

This war does not seem to be producing good. —We should be inclined to despair, unless we felt ourselves thrown back on God, and we are driven to ask afresh : How does the Kingdom of God come ?— The Apocalyptic Kingdom.—The Kingdom come in Christ.—The Kingdom within.

V. CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION. J. ST. G. HEATH, M.A. - - - 73

Established religion does not make a nation truly Christian.—Our present civilization largely pagan. —The evils of competition.—Leaves no room for conception of vocation.—Makes corporate service almost impossible.—Induces national rivalry.— Material is considered stronger than spiritual under present system.—To preach peace we must live peace.

PAGE

VI. PERSONALITY AND WAR. WAR'S GLORY AND ITS CRIME. BY W. FEARON HALLIDAY, M.A. - - - 83

War destroys persons for principles.—Principles have worth only as related to personality.—Soul the only thing of absolute worth in the world.—Science and art meaningless unless in relation to soul. The objective world calls out soul.—Religion and morality emphasise the absolute value of soul. War only one of the ways in which the present social system denies the soul.—The glory of war: (*a*) to make sacrifices for principle; (*b*) to show that the individual is part of a larger whole.—The deceptions of self-sacrifice.—The failure of sacrifice that does not express soul and call out good in others. The crime of War.—It is one-sided, and if it calls out good in comrades, it evokes wrong in enemies.—Soul only called out by soul.—Hence an individual matter and cannot be done by material force.—No common denominator between force and reason.—Nations should train men for humanity, not for themselves. —The solution must keep the glory of self-sacrifice as well as calling out the soul in others.—The Cross the expression of Jesus Christ, the revelation of God. —It asserts: (*a*) the absolute value of the soul; (*b*) the value and right of other souls.—Its appeal is personal, and on the spiritual plane.—The task of the Church to organise the material by means of re-created individual souls.—The Church has failed in her application of principles to life, in her idea of self-sacrifice—it should not be dying to resist an enemy's material demand, but to capture his soul.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION 104

BIBLIOGRAPHY 109

INTRODUCTION

To many Christian writers and thinkers at the present time it seems clear that the war in which our nation is involved has been so plainly shown to be not only inevitable but even righteous, that they are compelled by a strong sense of duty to use all their influence in prosecuting it with vigour. Even though they may recognize the presence of a serious moral problem somewhere at the back of it all, they cannot allow any such thought to turn them from the necessary, if distasteful, task of conquering the enemy with all speed. This is the immediate concern of the nation, they say, and of every individual citizen. When it has been accomplished, there will be time enough to turn our attention to the moral perplexities which have been brought to light by the war. To give place to them now may seem a sign of weakness in the hour of danger.

This volume is not issued in order to criticize those who hold such a position. That many do so in all sincerity and good faith, and with an ardent desire for the good of humanity, the writers of these essays would readily acknowledge. Nor would they wish to suggest that the last word on this perplexing question has been uttered by them in the following pages. The fact is, we are all engaged together in the search after a better way of life, and one more fitting to the high

destinies for which we believe mankind to have been created. To no one school of thought belongs the monopoly of truth.

The writers of these pages cannot, however, consent to the view that the consideration of these questions should be deferred. For themselves they feel the need of stating why they cannot accept what many regard as the demand of a sacred duty. They recognize that far more thought should have been directed to these issues before the war, and they share the blame which rests upon the Church for having failed in this respect. To be silent now, however, would lay them open to the charge of moral cowardice and of compromising with their conscience.

Quite apart from personal considerations, which should not in any case be allowed to take precedence at a time like the present, the writers of these essays believe that there are the strongest reasons for handling these problems with courage and courtesy, and that Christianity will lose immeasurably if her leaders shrink from the task imposed upon them by the European catastrophe. What is needed is hard thinking, sound reasoning, and, above all, the teachable spirit to which the mysteries of the unseen world can be revealed.

All great moral ideals suffer more from indifference than from opposition. Peace societies might meet and discuss and resolve in time of peace. How many per thousand of the population took them seriously? How many really thought about the questions they raised? And of those who did, how many treated them as more than debating society problems? To-

day all this is changed. The secular press is open to letters on Christianity and war. In railway carriage or office we find men discussing the themes which were confined to select circles a few months ago. The air is electric with the sense that war is a real issue of life, and everywhere men are reaching out eagerly to see if there be no better way. If the Church cannot lead the thought of Europe towards a higher goal she will indeed be bankrupt. This is her hour. Men want to know the truth. "Who will show us any good?" is the cry of many a soul that is sickened with the horror of modern warfare. These problems can to-day be thrashed out in an atmosphere of reality, by keen men and women who feel that all that is best in life is bound up with the answer. It is no time to turn away from them, or to open our pulpits and our press to the presentation of only one aspect of them. Many a time the Church has longed for just such keenness, and has turned saddened away from the apathy and preoccupation of those whom she sought to interest.

For these questions do, as a matter of fact, lead us straight to the heart of our faith. They constitute a demand and provide an opportunity for us to restate in living terms those truths which are most vital to the Christian religion. We have no need to wander all round the circumference of our religion, as we have so often done, for fear men should be offended by our speaking at once of the central conceptions. If we have courage to face all that is involved in the present perplexities of many honest souls, we shall find that a great flood of light is being poured upon old truths, which had almost lost the power to arrest. We have

come back to them by a new and unfamiliar route, but when we reach them behold we find again what we seemed, through very familiarity, to have been on the point of losing.

There still remains to be stated the most pressing reason for the publication of this volume at the present time. The Church of Christ holds, if she only knew it, the key to the future. Where are we to look for an escape from the vicious circle in which war breeds war? Can any of the nations, as they now exist, lead the world away from war? We are all hopelessly compromised, neutrals and belligerents alike. We may think we desire peace, but do we desire it on any but our own terms? We turn to America as the largest neutral power with a civilization like our own. But can she truly help the world out of the maze in which she is herself entangled? We are all playing the game, even though the ball is being kept, for the moment, at one end of the field. Can any of the players deliver us from the necessity of for ever playing it?

There is, however, a body represented in all the nations, yet in its essence supra-national, which ought to be able to lead the world in to the paths of peace. It is essentially catholic, a body of persons of all races and colours who are bound together in a brotherhood which should be more binding than any other link between human spirits. It stands for the supreme worth of the individual, and, therefore, for an ideal of society in which no supposed interest of nation or of group can be built upon the surrender of the freedom and inherent rights of the individual

soul. It exists to bring in a Kingdom of Love by means which are wholly consistent with the spirit of love, and, therefore, to refuse to use any method which involves a denial of love. These three principles carry with them a condemnation of war and the war spirit. They cannot be uttered without our becoming conscious of the challenge to Christianity which is inherent in war. It is by consistently maintaining these principles that the Church may yet lead the world into the Promised Land. Her watchword should be, in the words of Romain Rolland, "Above the Battlefield." To his challenge we are bound to seek an answer. "Can we not," he says, "sacrifice ourselves without sacrificing our neighbours as well?" If, however, for some supposed national interest, the Church is now silent in regard to those very principles which may help us to find the way to true peace, if, in giving them forth, she is unwilling to accept the full implications of loyalty to them, or if she urges a course of action which actually involves a denial of them, is it not clear that she thereby surrenders her right to utter them when the war is over, as the fundamental principles of a new world order?

While the Church hesitates, there are numbers outside her borders who have no doubt that the present situation reveals a failure on her part to understand her true function in Society. Many of these are not bitter critics, but reverent and earnest seekers. They have looked for light and leading, and have turned away disappointed. It may be that some such will welcome in this volume what is at least a serious attempt to face and state the full meaning of the

Christian demand in relation to war. From them, no less than from the members of organized Christian bodies, we have a right to expect help in the supreme task that opens out before the race. Perhaps, by some such united effort we may find our way to a truer conception of the Church, as well as to a mission more worthy of the high ideals which have been committed to her.

What the writers of these papers desire is that the Church may take her rightful place when the war is over, and may at last proclaim a living message with prophetic power, a message which shall direct the minds of men to those great truths in obedience to which the health of the nations is to be found. What they fear is that she may lose her chance of proclaiming that message then, because now she has not spoken with the note of reality and conviction, and because she has not dared to face the full meaning of the problem involved in this war. If they can help towards avoiding this danger, and preparing for the new day—in however small a way—they will be rewarded for taking a course which they are well aware may cause misunderstanding at a time of crisis like the present.

HENRY T. HODGKIN.

I

THE QUEST OF CHRISTIAN DUTY IN WARTIME

I

When war was declared in the early days of August last the Christian people of these islands were thrown into no little bewilderment. The events which led up to it had followed one another with a stupefying rapidity. There was no time to think or to take one's bearings,—still less to take any action, even had we been prepared with a definite line of action to take. One had the impression of being swept over the brink of a Niagara by vast daimonic currents that had got wholly out of hand. We were caught in the horror almost before we knew it.

The conviction that war is essentially unchristian had been for many years steadily establishing itself in the Christian opinion of the country. But it had not been analysed far enough to provide the mass of people with a set of definite principles which they could apply to the situation that had arisen. The instinct against war had not been confirmed upon a rational basis. Perhaps the possibility of war between the great European powers had seemed so remote that it was felt to be hardly worth while to take the trouble to work out a coherent intellectual construction of the sentiment. However that may be, the war took us almost at

unawares; and there were few people at the time possessed of the necessary apparatus for arriving at a valid Christian estimate of the position.

We were therefore confronted there and then with the difficult task of adjusting ourselves to this new and unexpected situation. We were able, after the first paralysing onset had spent itself to review the course of events with a measure of deliberation.

Two classes of people were not aware of any difficulty,—the uncompromising pacificist who held that under all circumstances war as a cure is worse than the disease, and those at the opposite pole who did not feel that war in itself was unchristian. But between these two extremes was a great mass of people to whom the problem presented itself with no such simplicity; and among these several tendencies of thought were discernible.

For the greater part of this middle body of opinion the case of Belgium was decisive. Passionate life-long pacificists were constrained to the view that we had engaged ourselves in a "righteous" war. We were confronted with a choice between war and dishonour; and the nation rightly chose to preserve its honour. The case of the nation was not only morally sound, but it appeared to be a religious duty to maintain it at whatever cost. It was plainly the right thing to stand by the weak; and even though war be an awful and a hateful affair, it was in this case a noble enterprise of chivalry from which Christian men need not shrink.

This became the normal view; and it indicates a genuine moral sensibility in the nation for which it is impossible to be too grateful. But there was a con-

siderable body of opinion which failed to accept this view on the ground that, distressing as the case of Belgium undoubtedly was, it could not be fairly abstracted from the general historical situation. On the one hand was the grave instability of international relationships through many years produced by the theory of the Balance of Power in Europe, combined with the doubtful traditions of secret diplomacy. On the other was the armaments policy of the Great Powers which had turned Europe into a colossal powder magazine. One spark would be sufficient to produce an explosion. The spark fell at Serajevo; and the violation of Belgian neutrality was simply a part of the explosion. That the immediate responsibility for the war lies at the door of Austria and Germany is beyond question, but future historians will exempt no single one of the great European states from a measure of complicity in the unspeakable catastrophe which has ensued.

These circumstances raised for many people personal questions of extreme gravity. For years they had protested against the spirit and policy which lay behind international relationships in Europe. They had lifted up their voices in public and in private against the increase in armaments; they had declared that the idea that peace could be preserved by making ready for war was a monstrous and dangerous illusion,—and this they had done as they believed in obedience to and in consistency with the mind of Christ. Their fears were realised far more swiftly and tragically than they had anticipated; and the war appeared to them to be the climax of those tendencies to which

they had continuously opposed themselves. With perfect logic such persons might claim to be absolved from any responsibility for what had come to pass and from any support of or participation in the war.

But they were prevented from making such a claim by another consideration. They could not divest themselves of a sense of corporateness with the nation ; nor could they ignore the circumstances that disaster had befallen the nation, partly, at least, because of the feebleness of their witness. It was to no little extent due to their unfaithfulness and lack of courage that the country had entangled itself in the *melée* which had produced this terrible result. This, they felt, was no time to cut out and disown responsibility. They seemed to have no alternative at this point but to make common cause with the nation. If the nation was involved in sin by participating in the war, they must consent to share the sin.

But once more they were confronted with a difficulty. What in this case, of their personal loyalty to Jesus Christ ? They were fully persuaded that war was contrary to the mind of Christ, and as His disciples participation in war was forbidden to them. Must they then do as British citizens what as Christian believers they were forbidden to do ? Here there seemed to be a conflict of loyalties which was not easily resolved. Were they justified at this crisis in taking a sub-Christian platform ? Revered voices assured them that the cause of the nation was the cause of Christ. Round about them they saw men enlisting by the thousand from motives of chivalry and honour, who did not doubt that the immediate Christian duty

was to take up arms. But much as they respected the motives of those who were enlisting, they found themselves prohibited from following their example by the persistent conviction that war meant the killing of men, their brethren " for whom Christ died," that it was the crowning negation of the love which they found revealed in the life and death of Jesus Christ ; and that it entailed a hundred accessory moral evils which must be abhorrent to their Master's mind.

II

This dilemma is stated here in the most acute form ; but it was felt with varying degrees of intensity by a great number of people. Not a few will recognise in this description a faithful transcript of their own heartsearchings. It is beyond our present purpose to enquire how the problem was solved by those whom it affected. Our present interest in it is that it moves us to ask how such a conflict of loyalties came to be possible. What was the confusion of thought that underlay a situation in which a man could preserve his devotion to Christ only by seeming to forsake his duty to his country ?

So long as the problem remained exclusively personal, satisfactory relief from it seemed somewhat remote. But when the Bishops and the leaders of the Free Churches, who by reason of office or of personal distinction, were understood to speak for the Christian society, began to support our participation in the war and to stimulate recruiting, the situation took on a different aspect. Whatever the immediate duty of the individual Christian citizen might be, it became

perfectly plain to many thoughtful people, both within the Church and without, that it was taking a very dubious course by endorsing the prevailing view of the war. The Church stands or falls by its loyalty to the Christian ethic ; and unless we are to regard the State as the authoritative and final exponent of Christian moral practice, that the Church should endorse any war seems on the face of it an apostacy from its first principles.

For, to begin with, it ought to be clear in an age which has developed the historical sense beyond any that went before it, that no particular war can be abstracted from the general sequence of events of which it forms a part and be judged independently of its setting. As things are, war is always latent in the world. International rivalry is potential war; and soon or late it breaks out into actuality. From the Christian standpoint war is the natural product of an unchristian world-order. In any given war one side will always be more responsible than the other for the events which led to it. But both sides have equally accepted a way of life which made war not only possible, but at last inevitable. For the Christian Church a war should be an unmistakable revelation of the real nature of the world-order, just as the Cross is the revelation of the principle of the divine order. It is an unveiling of all the unethical processes which are entailed by the traditional conceptions of international relationships. The case is not met by the citation of texts which seem to be for or against war in the abstract. One text may always be countered by another. And it is pure muddleheadedness that isolates war from its setting and handles it as "a thing in

itself." War is one of the results of a certain way of life, and that way of life is in direct antithesis to the whole spirit and tendency of the Christian tradition. The plain fact is that England was so involved in this way of life with other nations that a point came when it could not do the right thing,—that is, to take up the case of Belgium,—without being plunged in the tragic sin of war, which simply demonstrates the law that it is impossible to cut off the entail of sin. Let it be remarked that this implies no criticism of England as a political entity. It simply points out how patently the Church failed to call things by their proper names.

Nor does it relieve the situation appreciably to discuss academic questions relating to the use of force. No one denies that physical force has its legitimate uses within the commonwealth. In itself it has no moral quality. It assumes the moral colour of the end to which and the spirit in which it is exercised. But it is mere moonshine to describe war only as the exercise of physical force. Its proper social analogy is the settling of an old and deep-seated quarrel by fisticuffs,—a proceeding futile in itself and contrary to social order. War cannot fruitfully be discussed in the abstract. It must be regarded in its concrete expressions. In its origins, its conduct, and its consequences, especially under modern conditions it is a phenomenon that no plausible arguments derived from the legitimacy of the use of force within the commonwealth can invest with moral respectability for the man who professes to find in the Cross of Jesus Christ the way of real life.

This world-order in which war is inherent the

Church exists to transform. Consequently when the Church ranges itself in support of the method of war which is the final product of this particular way of life, it is not only proclaiming its own failure, but it is hauling down its own flag and hoisting instead the flag of the world. It is giving its case away and "queering its own pitch." Christian leaders who have given their blessing to this war will be hard put to it at the close of the war to meet the arguments of the militarists. They have in this instance subscribed to the doctrine of force and it will be used in evidence against them. They must expect to find their very citadel assailed from the ground which, by their recent action, they have ceded to a more dangerous and desperate enemy than Germany.

It was something like historical myopia that led responsible Christian leaders to apply the term "righteous" to this war. In historical judgments it is always a precarious thing to isolate events; and no judgment upon the present situation is at all likely to be sound which does not embrace the course of the whole generation preceding it. The incidents of last July do not furnish us with all the data. The roots of the present tragedy go far back beyond Serajevo; they are to be found ramifying through the whole complex and shifting international situation of the last half century. And while it has been freely admitted that the major responsibility for the present crisis belonged to Germany and its ally, it must in all honesty be asserted that not one of the powers involved in it is absolved from a certain share of the burden. In the last analysis the war must be laid at the door of the

spirit and method of international relationships in Europe to which each of the great Powers had furnished its contribution. In the tangle which followed, it was not the business of the Church to take a side. No estimate of our national obligation to Belgium should have allowed Christian folk to forget our complicity in the diplomatic game and the armaments race of the last generation. It may be urged that this war was forced upon England; and the politician, judging by his own standards, may plead that argument with a measure of justice. But it is not an argument which the Church can adopt. It is in the world to oppose and transform the world-order that now is. Its foundation is the Cross and the Resurrection,—that great episode which is the classic vindication of faith in the sovereignty of those spiritual and moral forces of which the traditions and aims of modern international relationships are a concrete denial. "Righteous" is a description which can be applied to no war by one who derives his conception of righteousness from the Cross.

What then under these circumstances should the Church have stood for? For neutrality? Assuredly not. Neutrality is a poor thing. If the Church rests upon any reality at all, it should have at this time a positive and constructive ministry to exercise as far removed from neutrality as from partisanship.

The New Testament is for ever bidding us to do for others what God has done for us. "Be ye kind to one another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, as God in Christ forgave you." "If God so loved us, we also ought to love one another." The Atonement is the

ground of the Christian ethic, and it supplies the regulative principle of the Church's ministry in the world. That God has reconciled us to Himself in Jesus Christ carries with it as its corollary that He has committed to us a ministry of reconciliation,——not only to call men to personal reconciliation to Himself, but to effect the whole range of reconciliations in society and in the world by which God's will shall be done " as in heaven so on earth." Amid the fightings and divisions incidental to human life, the Church stands as the minister of reconciliation. When Austria, that historic bulwark of the Papacy, requested a blessing on its arms, the late Pope refused, saying, " I bless peace," and he was right. And a state of war does not justify a moratorium upon the reconciling activity of the Church. Rather does it make such activity more necessary and urgent.

But is not the Church to throw its weight on the side of a righteous cause? Certainly, if it can find a wholly righteous one. But in international disputes on the traditional plane, righteousness is a matter of more or less. A man once approached our Lord with the request that he should bid his brother divide the inheritance with him. The man's grievance was apparently well grounded. But our Lord gave him neither support nor sympathy. He simply cut down beneath the quarrel to its roots and said to the man, " Beware of covetousness." He had not come to divide inheritances but to remove the temper which leads to family quarrels over the division of property. If there were no covetousness in the world, inheritances would divide themselves without trouble and bad blood.

Here is a plain moral for the Church. Its office is not to adjust responsibility in international disputes. That lies far beyond its competency. It is in the world to remove those passions and ambitions out of which international quarrels issue. Having failed to do this, the Church does not mend matters by taking at a particular juncture what seems to be the morally superior side.

This view is reinforced by the principle of the catholicity of the ideal Church. Despite its own domestic disunion, the Church is essentially a supra-national society within which distinctions of race are irrelevant. The declension of the Church from its catholicity is an old story into which we cannot enter. But if the New Testament view is to be retained it is plainly contained in it that a British Christian should be sensible of closer kinship with a German Christian than with a Briton who is not a Christian. That this is not actually so is simply an additional piece of evidence of the modern Church's failure to realise all the implications of its basal principles. If the avowed Christians of Germany, Great Britain, Austria, France and Russia had been really conscious of their unity in Christ, and had declined to go forth to kill one another, there would have been no war. If it be urged against this view that nationality is a divinely appointed principle, and that it must be recognised and respected, there is a two-fold answer. First, that Christian unity is a principle of superior authority ; and second, that the principle of nationality is not destroyed by the growth of Christian unity. What happens is that the conception of nationality

is redeemed from the bondage of the narrow and selfish nationalism which lies at the root of the international scrimmage of our time.

III

What emerges from this discussion is the existence over against one another of two orders of life,—the one naturalistic, the world-order which is determined by the natural instincts of humanity, the other spiritual, the divine order revealed in the Cross of Jesus Christ and to be represented concretely in the world in the Christian society. The Christian view of the relation of these two orders is that the latter is in the world in order to redeem the former by assimilating it to itself. In principle and in expression the world-order and the Christian order are opposed at every point.

The prevailing attitude of the Church as it is defined by its leading spokesmen seems to arise from a grave confusion of mind respecting the relation of the Christian society to the world round about it. This originates in a peculiarly insidious type of pessimism which surrenders the world to the devil. A man who has been deeply stirred by his first recognition of the miseries consequent upon our social maladjustments remarked to the present writer, " I suppose it is all involved in the system ; and we cannot change that." That indicates a very wide-spread frame of mind, the acceptance of the present world-order as an inevitable and fixed condition under which the Christian life has to be lived. The question for the Christian is this,—whether he is content to accept and to endeavour after the Christian ideal under the conditions and limi-

tations imposed by the existing world-order, or whether he believes that the world-order should and can be transformed agreeably to the full possibilities of the Christian life. Must he submit to the "system" or can he and shall he revolutionise it ?

For the most part the average Christian person has settled down to the former view, with the result that he fails to distinguish clearly between the secular and the Christian criteria of righteousness. The international game as it is played to-day, rests in the first instance upon the doctrine of national self-interest ; the apparatus of the game is expediency and ultimately the appeal to physical force. But humanity has so far advanced that it has succeeded in imposing certain restrictions on the game in the form of international law, Hague Conventions and the like. Righteousness according to the secular criteria consists in respecting the rules of the game. But the Christian criterion of righteousness condemns the whole game outright. From the standpoint of the Christian moralist the whole game is founded upon a vicious pagan principle, and no rules can moralise it.* It must in the last resort be destructive of its own rules. The shelling of Whitby shows how frail the rules of the game are when the principle of the game is pushed to its logical end. The Christian society cannot consistently act even as umpire in the game. It is bound to declare the whole game contrary to the principles for which it stands. And unless it is going to accept the view (which must in the end be deadly to

* The famous saying of Cavour is not irrelevant here : "I always know how to mislead diplomatists. I tell them the truth."

itself) that the game is beyond remedy or change (in which case it hands the world over to the devil) it must in a definite and forthright way oppose itself to it. It must recognise that, as Mr. Chesterton has said, the characteristic Christian demand is for a new world.

The abolition of war is bound up with the destruction of the game. This is why simple pacificism is bankrupt. As well try to grow figs on thistles as endeavour to superimpose peace on the existing international system. It is a hopeless mating of incongruities. Palliations and alleviations may be effected no doubt by the expansion of international law, arbitration treaties and the like. But so long as single nations still assert the right to take the law into their own hands in certain eventualities, so long will war remain possible. And inasmuch as no nation will ever commit its most sensitive and vulnerable possession—its honour—to the keeping of any arbitration court in the world, there will be a broad margin permanently uncovered by safeguards against war. The only real security against war is international goodwill; and the establishment of international goodwill involves a "transvaluation of values" on a stupendous scale. It necessitates, for instance, a complete revolution in our conception of nationality. As things are, the ultimate regulative principle of national conduct is self-interest. A nation may indeed engage in altruistic ventures provided they leave its own integrity and power intact. But in general, nations conceive themselves bound in the first place to increase their power, to maintain their prestige, to develop their commerce and to guard their frontiers. Other nations come to be regarded as

commercial rivals and possible predatory enemies, against whom it is always necessary to be prepared to fight. But over against this estimate of national well-being there may be placed another—a very ancient ideal. The Prophet Isaiah conceived of his nation as the suffering servant of Jehovah. This is a nation which lives not for dominion but for obedience, not for empire but for service, a nation which is sensible of a vocation for universal service and realises that its well-being is bound up with the abundance of its contribution to the life and wealth of the world.

But, it may be urged, such a transformation of national ideals with all the consequent changes in international relationships is a fantastic dream. It may be a long task, but it is not an impossible one. Nor is it the one from which the Christian soul will shrink when once it realises all that is implied in the Christian conception of faith. "Nothing shall be impossible to you," said our Lord. There is no system or institution in the world which cannot be changed,—simply because man can be changed. The world is, after all, no brute intractable mass with which there can be no argument. Pessimism about the world runs flat in the face of historical evidence.

> "Ah love, could you and I with Him conspire
> To grasp this sorry scheme of things entire,
> Would we not shatter it to bits, and then
> Remould it nearer to our heart's desire?"

So runs the musical despair of Omar. But that is just what the Christian may do if he has a mind to. It may be a long and arduous enterprise but it is not beyond his resources. But it will never be

accomplished unless Christian folk take it seriously and deliberately in hand.

There are those who justify war because of the tonic qualities is seems to possess. They tell us how it quickens the blood of youth, evokes their capacity for sacrifice, how in a hundred ways it stimulates and strengthens national life. But the truth is that war has only revealed the existence of qualities which were already latent in our life ; and it is part of the reproach of the Church that it failed to utilize all this capacity for self-denying and courageous service in the enterprises of the kingdom of God. From every Church throughout the land young men have trooped to the colours ; and it has been in many ways an uplifting spectacle. But what was the Church about all these years that it failed to discover these untold resources of energy and heroism that were stored up in its young men, and did not mobilize them in the cause of social regeneration and evangelism ? Had the Church marshalled its hosts of young manhood and womanhood for the purposes of the Kingdom of God with the enthusiasm and the passion with which they have responded to the call to arms, the transformation of the world-order would appear to be no quixotic and visionary adventure but a piece of quite practical politics.

And to some such task as this the Church should address itself now. Nor should it be deterred from it by the existing state of war. This war is only an episode in the course of the world which it is the business of the Church to redeem. There are some who see implicit in the position stated here a demand that

those who accept it should bend their efforts to stopping the war. But this conclusion fails to take due account of the view that this war only makes manifest and concrete a state of latent and potential war which is chronic in the world. They would welcome a speedy cessation of hostilities, but they cannot blind themselves to the fact that whenever the war ends it will be followed by a settlement on the basis of political expediency which will start the same old cycle of international suspicion, hate, and illwill, and lead to the same deadly consummation in another generation. They recognise that they are called to a task of a more radical character than that of stopping the war. They see themselves committed to a struggle to destroy the spirit and the way of life which bear the fruit of war. But their witness is not merely a negative word of protest. It is the constructive presentation of love as it is revealed in the life and death of Jesus Christ, as the sufficient basis of human life and as the solvent of that chronic state of war in the social and the international order out of which domestic unrest and external confusion arise. And those to whom the constraint of this testimony comes cannot afford to wait till the end of the war before they make it. They must make it now, for it is not for them to pick and choose the season of their obedience to Christ.

RICHARD ROBERTS.

II

THE NATURE OF THE CHRISTIAN OBEDIENCE.

In seeking the right path for Christian people to walk in, when war broke out at the beginning of August, 1914, it was assumed by many of us that we had before us only a choice of evils. In the glare of the conflagration we looked back and saw with sudden and terrible clearness, all the steps that had brought us where we were. And as we are all members of the nation, responsible each in our degree for the national temper, acquiescent—most of us—in a state of affairs which, though we had called it "peace" was in fact war in its jealous fear of other nations, we began to think of the war rather as a punishment than as a crime, and to believe that it was the lesser of two evils to accept our part in it. The nation, some of us thought, would do worse to remain neutral than to go to war, and to go to war—owing to a past for which we were all together responsible—was the only way in which to fulfil our obligations. With heavy hearts we assented to the belief that we had only a choice of evils.

It is this belief that lies at the heart of the difference between those who still preach peace and those who uphold the war as not good in itself, but better than the only alternative that was open to us—neutrality.

And those that are for peace must realize that so much of the view that they dissent from is true, that there is a real difference between a "just" and an "unjust" war. There is an eternal difference between an aggressive war against a little nation, and a war of self-defence, or a war in defence of the weak. There is an element of greatness which will never fail to move the human spirit in such a war as the American war against slavery, the wars of Holland for religious freedom, the wars of the Italian Risorgimento. And inasmuch as many have thrown themselves into the present war because they would not stand aside and see Belgium trampled upon, there is greatness in this war also. For a pagan country, it may be said that there was no better course open than the one we took, and that the choice was truly one of evils.

But for Christians the decision is a harder one, and its difficulty arises from the fact that when we turn to our Lord for guidance we find a paradox in His teaching on conflicting claims. We have a divided loyalty between our duty as citizens and our duty as Christians, and this division is reflected in the divided counsels of Christian people to-day. Some think that we should do as the nation does, and if we do so at peril to our souls, we must incur that danger. It is our business to help each other to do the best we can, and at this time our nation *is* doing the best it can—*has* risen to its utmost capacity of idealism—in fighting for Belgium and France. We therefore must help it to do this, disregarding ourselves, hoping for a better future, and realizing with penitence our own share in the guilt which makes that "better" not possible now.

Such a position has much that is Christ-like in it. None can fail to be impressed with the emphasis laid on human love and service and sharing, by Christ. No religion is so human as His religion. None inculcates a greater forgetfulness of oneself, one's soul, one's life, or more insistently proclaims that Our Father finds that love alone to be real which expresses itself in human service. Not those who believed, or preached or prayed well are in Christ's parable found fit for the Kingdom; but those who in corporal works of mercy served their fellow-men. Not those guilty of gross sins—as we conceive them—bore the weight of His denunciation; but those Pharisees who held themselves apart and thought themselves better than other men. And greatest of all His words of love is that saying—"He that seeketh to save his life shall lose it."

On the other side stands the absolute claim of Jesus Christ, "Whosoever loveth his father and mother more than Me, is not worthy of Me" . . . "If a man *hate not* his father and mother, yea, and his own life also" (and his nation?) "he cannot be My disciple." There is the tremendous nature of His claim for Himself: "Whither I go ye know, and the way ye know. Thomas saith unto Him, Lord, we know not whither Thou goest; and how can we know the way? Jesus saith unto him, I am the Way . . ."

There is something to those outside the Christian faith, terrible, almost repulsive, in such claims as these. "Other religious teachers," says a critic, "point their disciples to God. But Jesus of Nazareth, with a a colossal egoism, points to Himself—'I am the Way.'"

How is it that no Christian finds this egoism in Christ? And how do we reconcile the paradox of His insistence on the reality of that love only which shows itself in human service and sharing, with this other insistence—"If any man hate not his father and mother . . . he cannot be My disciple"?

If the paradox were indeed a contradiction, we should be forced, if we thought honestly and clearly, to give up one or the other. We do not, because we know that though Truth is very often only to be expressed in a paradox, it never involves a real contradiction. Both of these teachings are true and both to be obeyed. But how?

First, it is clear that our Lord, in His own life rejected the view that the nation's claim is absolute. And His refusal to take the "national" position, and become the leader of a national revolt against oppression, is the more significant that—by our own standards—it was not an unjust cause that He was desired to lead. The Roman rule over Palestine was a cruel and a tyrannous oppression. Resistance to it was as noble a task as the resistance to Austria of Garibaldi and Mazzini. And it is certain that the Jewish peoples hoped that Christ would lead an armed rebellion against their rulers—that He would follow in the footsteps of the Maccabees, and, at last, set His people free. Our Lord refused. It was His refusal that turned the people against Him. When they cried "Crucify Him!" they expressed their hatred of the man who might have helped his people, and who would not.

The impression left upon His disciples was that they

must follow His example. They offered no resistance to persecution. Their women and their children suffered, and themselves ; but it did not occur to them that they had a right to resist, or that the example given to them by their Master could be for any reason set aside. They seemed to have felt, with Tertullian, that when He disarmed St. Peter, Christ disarmed them all.

We are accustomed to say that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church. And we are right. For no man is converted by a preacher who does not in his life prove that he believes what he teaches : and everyone who does so is a preacher whether he speaks in pulpits or not. There is no missionary force like a life, and we who still speak of the " ages of faith " with a great longing, could have them back to-day, if we would give our lives for them. But we have first to realize how singularly unimpressive to the non-Christian, is our attitude towards our own faith. Briefly our doctrine of compromise with the world is summed up in the text—" Give not your pearls unto swine." The world, we say, is not yet ready for the Kingdom as we see it : it cannot reach the standard we shall some day set before it. We therefore will read the Sermon on the Mount aloud in our churches, to remind us of the vision we have to strive after. But when the nation relies not on love, but on torpedoes and machine-guns, we will commend what is good in its action, and be silent on what is bad."

Is this really the meaning Christ put on His own words ? That they should be preached and made known, but with the proviso that we are not expected

to put them into practice at present? It is hard to believe it. The world, wholly unconscious of any superiority over the average Christian in swinelike qualities, is moved indeed by the Christ-life lived, to an effort, however pathetically weak and unsuccessful, to follow after; it is moved by the spectacle of Christians preaching a gospel to be practised in the future, to nothing but a conviction that the preachers do not believe in their own doctrine. Christ came to a world not ready for Him—so unready that it crucified Him. He taught His disciples that they must not be overcome with evil, but must overcome it with good; and by "good" He does not seem to have meant swords and other arms but love and patience and kindness and meekness. He rebuked a disciple who imagined that he might defend his Master with the sword, and those others who desired to punish a village which rejected Him. He did not wait to come until the world was sufficiently advanced at least not to crucify Him and torture His disciples. He did not tell them that some day, when good was stronger and men better than now, it would be their duty to rely wholly on love and put aside earthly weapons of defence. He told them to overcome evil with good *now*, and in this command there was surely contained a promise—the promise that good is really stronger than evil; not to be stronger some day, but stronger *now*. They were, they believed, to stake everything on this promise, and to go on believing it, even if it resulted in their death. For Christ, believing in the triumph of love, was crucified, and so they knew that the most frightful risks and the most abject (apparent) failure were to

be accepted with unshaken confidence in His promise. They were to " be perfect " not at some future time when other people also were better, and they no longer tied and bound with the chain of their own sins ; but *now.* And again the command implies a promise. For the pagan world there may only be a choice of evils, but for the Christian, the command is, " Be ye perfect." This surely is the liberty of Christ.

We are reminded that Christ also said—" I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." In the light of the command " Be ye perfect," we are hardly free to interpret this as permission to put off the hour of complete obedience to a future time. It is surely part of the same truth that " He that doeth the will shall know of the doctrine." Christ, laying down His guiding principles for us, knew that His followers could not see at once how such principles would work out in life. He knew also that as each sought to apply and live them, he would find the way. But He surely never meant that we were free *not* to apply them, as they revealed themselves ! When once we see that the sacredness of human personality forbids (for example) slavery ; or the sacredness of the body, prostitution ; we are not then free to assent to these things. The moment of seeing is the moment for action. There are many things, doubtless, that we cannot yet " bear," which are therefore not revealed to us. But when they are revealed, we must move forward. It cannot be that we should sin against the light. Nor can it be that we should withhold from others the light that comes to us. " Heaven doth with us as we with torches do—not light them for them-

selves." And progress comes by no automatic revelation, but by the blood and sweat of those who see and cannnot forget or turn away. Each seeks the truth after his fashion, but if he sees it and does not struggle after it, it will not reveal itself in spite of him. He must strive after it, until he falls, and another takes his place and sees further and strives better. And so the world follows after, and at last all see. But the world does not follow a light of which a man says, "I see it, but you cannot, and so I shall not try to reach it yet." The world only believes from this that he does not really see the light at all, and turns to other prophets who at least believe what they say. Perhaps it stones them; but it believes them in the end, and it will not believe any other.

If then we believe in Christianity in the sense that we believe it to be the redemptive force of the world, we must live it. There is no other missionary force. And here the heart of our paradox appears. It is true that Christ's claim upon us is absolute, supreme, immediate. But there is no such conflict of loyalties as we feared, for only by perfect loyalty to Him can we be loyal to our fellow-men. Imperfect as we are, it is only in perfection that we recognise the true type of humanity—Ecce Homo! Behold the Man! It was not for nothing that the only Man altogether without sin called Himself "Son of Man" as well as God. Our sins and imperfections divide us: there is no such thing as a *bond* of hatred or a *communion* of sin. Sin always divides and destroys. But in a perfect Man, we imperfect ones realize our real humanity: in Christ we are one. The nearer we come to Him, the more

truly we live His life, the more loyal are we to all our obligations to our fellow-men. We may seem apart and alone, as did our Lord upon the Cross. But the separation is seeming, the loyalty is real. Everything that is sin disunites, and everything that is less than ideal is less than perfect loyalty. Could anything be more "separatist" in fact than this belief that we must wait, we Christians, to insist on perfect obedience to our Lord, till the world is ready for it? The world is much better than we think. We dare not say to it, "Be ye perfect," because we believe that though we are ready others are not ready. But Christ said it, and though they crucified Him, He conquered. Was He, when He refused to lead a national revolt, when He foresaw and wept over the destruction of Jerusalem, yet assented to it, more or less true to His own people, because He was true to an ideal first? If we had followed Him without compromise, as did His first disciples, we should have been accused, as they were, of being "bad citizens," disloyal to the State; but we should by now have made war impossible, and saved the world from evils unspeakable, and hatred and disunity. If we had accepted in August, 1914, His teaching in its glorious idealism, we should even then perhaps have saved Belgium and the world from a devastating conflict. If now we did so, not because the sacrifices of war are too great, but because we see that peace is better, and love a greater force than war—what then would happen? Still it would be true that loyalty to Christ would include all other loyalties, and only loyalty to Christ can perfectly do so. This is what is meant by "believing on Christ." Sometimes

we clearly see it, and see how it is so; sometimes we cannot see how, and we still believe and set out on our way. Christ did not answer (in one sense) St. Thomas's question—"Lord, we know not whither Thou goest, and how can we know the way?" But He said, "I am the Way."

There is no time at which our Saviour ceases to be the Way. There is no time at which good is less strong or evil stronger than before. We plead that *now* is not the time, and point to our own sins as ground and excuse for putting off the hour of the ideal. We "make a god of our own weakness and bow down to it." And it is true that every succeeding sin has made it harder to turn to Christ, but it is not true that any sin has absolved us from doing so. It is true that in putting off so long our attempt to make the will of God prevail "in earth as it is in heaven," we have made a world very unlike heaven; but it is not true that at any time we are justified in putting it off a little longer, until it is a little easier. It will never be easier. If we do not believe in the Sermon on the Mount in such sense that we consent to live by it when it is dangerous, we shall not find the world ready to listen to it when it is safe. The world is not so false as that. It would not give to any human leader the half-hearted obedience that we Christians call loyalty to Christ. Let us at least choose whom it is that we follow, and if we cannot follow Him now, let us take another name and leave the name of "Christian" to those who perhaps some day will be able to do so. We are not worthy of it. "From that time many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him. Then said Jesus unto

the twelve, Will ye also go away ? " If they had gone, they might well have said it was the best that they could do. Certainly the Jews were not ready for Christ ; but they were ready, perhaps, to make great sacrifices in a noble cause. They were ready to rise against a mighty tyrant, and sweep away, even at the cost of their lives, a horrible oppression. This was the best that they could do, and it was great. A man could wish no nobler cause, and surely no Jew could, at such a time, do less. But if they had gone away, these few, these ignorant, materially minded, ambitious, faithless few, always misunderstanding their Master's teaching, persistently disputing which should be the greatest and what their reward—if they had gone away ? There must have been better men in Israel, surely, than some of these disciples of Jesus of Nazareth, with their incredible failures and selfishness and fears. But only these accepted the leadership of Christ at any risk and without reserve. Were they more or less true to their fellow-men in being so true to Him ? Doubtless those who were already suffering in the national cause held them false, and called them traitors. The conscience of the world has reversed that judgment now.

A. Maude Royden.

III

THE CHRISTIAN BASIS FOR SOCIETY

THE following pages are an attempt to maintain a very simple thesis, and one which might be supposed to be fully accepted by the Church of Christ, and to need no further demonstration. The European War has, however, rudely shaken our complacent belief in ourselves, and we are discovering afresh, in the glaring light which it sheds on all human life, that we have only half understood the very doctrines we profess. We are compelled to question ourselves very closely as to what we do understand by such terms as catholicity, patriotism, brotherhood. Above all, there is one little word which is supposed to enshrine within itself all that is most distinctive and most precious in our Christian faith, and which expresses more perfectly than any other the very nature of the God whom we worship. This word has sore need of reinterpretation to our generation. The attempt to define and expound the meaning of Love will, indeed, always fail of ultimate success, because its full import can only be seen in life. We may, however, attempt to make some contribution, even in a brief essay, towards understanding the task of expressing love in the life of the individual and of the community.

To state our thesis briefly, then, would be to say that we hold *the conviction that the principle of love,*

as interpreted to us in the life and death of Jesus Christ, ought to be and can be applied as the sufficient basis for human society. In order that this ideal should become operative in any community of men and women, it is necessary that there should be :—

I. A general agreement as to the meaning of the statement.
II. Some common principles in regard to its application : and
III. A united committal to the full acceptance of it.

I.

What, then, is love as thus interpreted ? It is *not* a great many things that it is generally supposed to be. It is not a mere pleasurable emotion dependent only on temperamental affinities over which the will has no control. It is not something which discriminates between the good and the bad, going out to the one and withholding itself from the other. It is not that spirit which finds affinity with the " lovable " and lovely, and turns away from the " unlovable " and unlovely. It is no tender greenhouse plant which shrivels when exposed to the chill blasts of cynicism, indifference and opposition. It is not dependent on recognition and applause. It delights to do things secretly, and it rises to its greatest heights when met by unforgiving resentment, and by wilful misunderstanding and suspicion.

(i.) In the first place, then, love is the will to do good to others. Behind any true love such as Christ manifested is persistent goodwill, a force capable of regenerating our life, for the great fault in human society

is simply that the human will is not on the side of good. We approve the good in abstract, but we fail in the will to accomplish it in ourselves, and in our relations with others. Hence it is abundantly true that not only this war, but all the failure in our social order, is "the tragedy of the weak though righteous Christian will."* The golden rule involves more than what is generally spoken of as benevolence. The man who, of set purpose, does to another man something which will awaken in him the response of hatred, or which, if done to himself by the other, would have a like result, is surely, at some point, failing in perfect love. Yet this is what we do when we go forth to kill men in battle. Even if the men in the trenches can love one another, what of the response awakened in the widowed and the orphaned? Can it truly be said that we love these as we love the members of our own families? Perfect love will discover some means of leading the enemy to turn from his way without inflicting so grave an injury upon him.

(ii.) And this becomes the more apparent when we remember that love involves an effort of the imagination whereby we put ourselves in the place of those whom we love. The persistent attempt to understand the other man, or the other nation, is scarcely less necessary than the desire or will to do him good. "Half the cruelty in the world is due," says John Fiske, "to a stupid incapacity to put oneself in another person's place." A failure here means that we are in danger of thinking of him merely as one upon whom good must be done, and of forgetting how much good there is in

* H. G. Wells, in *The War that will end War*, p. 97.

him already. The man who would overcome the evil in a bully without the use of physical force must see his opponent not simply as a bully. To the bullying quality he naturally wishes to offer resistance. When he sees in the bully that essential divinity which is in all men, when he recognizes in him a brother man and one who has some nobler instincts waiting to be called out, then, and then only, is he in the way to overcome by love. If love be opposed to evil it must seek not merely to restrain the evil but to redeem the evil-doer. The preliminary to such redemption is the discovery in the evil-doer of that which is good, and the infection of the evil-doer with that same belief, so that he begins to believe in himself in a new way. This process is entirely different from the mere acceptance of evil which is often considered to be inherent in the principle of non-resistance.

In our international relations we have the same need for imagination. We have fallen into a sin against love just in so far as we regard our enemies to-day as purely evil, as entirely dominated, for example, by the teachings of Bernhardi, or as wholly committed to the method of atrocities. Love seeks not to crush but to redeem, and even in the men who are most responsible for the war it calls us to discover the germ of better things, to believe in some other side to their nature which is the true self. The very difficulty we have in doing this shows how far we are from the kind of love which Christ exhibited. The false ideas for which men or nations stand are not going to be crushed out of them by violence. If they are to be removed at all, it will be by the redemptive power of a love which

believes in something better. This lack of love-inspired imagination on both sides to-day leads us into a hopeless state of mind in regard to this and all wars. "It has never occurred to people that there is a possibility of doing without war. We are faced by a kind of stupidity that we cannot imagine a state of things in which war does not play a part as a recognized institution."* Love alone can lead us out of this despair, as it is applied through the imagination which "thinketh no evil."

(iii.) It would, in ordinary times, scarcely seem needful to insist that the kind of love which Christ displayed is not limited to any one nation. While He was a true patriot, and went first to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel," it is clear that He included the whole world of men and women in His design of love. He deliberately chose an alien to illustrate the law of love to neighbours, and He sent forth His disciples to every nation. Indeed, we cannot think of Christ as loving less than all men. If there is one thing more than another which the Church of Christ should, at this juncture, stand for, it is the catholic spirit, including within the circle of goodwill all alike. The more men seem to have fallen from the standard of true loving-kindness, the greater is the call to love them back into the path of goodness. Christians in England to-day are called not merely to refrain from hating the Germans and the German War Lords, but to heal the breach by a great outburst of love towards them. "True Christian love has no limits; when it governs and takes possession of the heart, it leads us to consider every

* Rev. Dr. Frere, in a sermon preached at Leeds, June, 1913.

country as our country, and every man as our brother."*

(iv.) When we have mentioned a few of the characteristics of love, we begin at once to realize how impossible it is to sum up the meaning of love by a definition of the obligations entailed in loving. The essence of the love of Christ is that it overflows all obligations. We recognize that those who truly love should do this and that. We try to do these very things, and behold we cannot! The duty to love is incumbent upon us; the power to love is absent. For love is a spirit; it is the Spirit of God within a man. Under the compulsion of love we have walked the one dreary mile footsore and complaining. When the love of Christ fills our hearts, we set forth with great delight to walk the second mile. It is this kind of love which has never yet been given a fair trial in human society. It is a principle of life which is bound to triumph. "Only one belief can justify love in setting out to conquer the world by the methods of love, and love alone—the belief that all the brute strength of man, all the world's armaments, all the strength of civic institutions based upon physical force, all the power of corporate antagonisms, are, when opposed to love, as the hardness of the earth's crust to the force of the expanding seed; are as the errant forces in earth and air and fire and water to the ingenuity of man that makes them servants of his pleasure-house; are, in fact, only as the power of mere man when pitted against the power of God and man combined. It is this conviction and the

* Epistle from the Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, 1830.

activities that arise from it that are essential to Christianity."*

If love, in this sense, is to be applied as the basis of human society, it is not to be checked and thwarted at every point by conventions, by prudence, by self-interest, by all the other considerations that commonly prevent us from giving it full scope. The dictates of true love themselves impose upon the merely benevolent impulse certain checks.† These alone are sufficient—this is the point of our argument. To accept this view undoubtedly involves in the world, as at present constituted, a continual risk of disaster and even of death. For our Lord it involved nothing short of Calvary. But it is argued that the risks are worth taking, stupendous though they be, because nothing less is really worthy of our destiny as the sons of God, and nothing else will enable us to discover the full possibilities of divine love in human life. If we accept the life and death of Jesus as the fullest manifestation of the divine method for overcoming evil, we can only say that we seek to show ourselves wiser than God if we allow our reason to lead us to any method for bringing in His Kingdom which is at variance with the spirit of love. He chose the method of self-sacrificing love as the best method available to supreme Power and Wisdom. If we accept this principle of love as the basis of human society, we are called upon to apply it, so far as we can see the method of its application,

* *The Practice of Christianity*, p. 282.

† A very ordinary example of this is when we are prompted by kindliness to give delicious, but unwholesome food to a child, but withheld from doing so by a love which teaches us that the consequences would be disastrous.

with absolute thoroughness, even although it may not appear to " work," any more than it appeared to in the case of our Lord Himself.

It should perhaps here be pointed out that Love, as thus interpreted, includes within itself the ideals of justice and truth. Justice must be given to another man or else we are not treating him in love. In demanding justice for ourselves we may be actuated by love to our brother. There are, however, times when the demand for full justice cannot be pressed in love, and here the latter must, according to our proposition, be regarded as the regulative principle. The classic illustration of this is the " Merchant of Venice."

In the same way, truth demands a standard which in regulating our attitude towards others is absolute. When another acts insincerely towards us, love to him demands that we help him to see his own insincerity, in order that he may become sincere. He may, however, incur by his insincerity penalties which we could not in love exact from him. We may even have to pay them ourselves, and thus bring home to him far more effectually the consequences of deviation from the truth. Christ exposed to the full the insincerity of the religious leaders of the day. But on the Cross He bore the full result of that insincerity rather than lift up His hand even, as we should say, " to vindicate the truth." In the light of events we cannot say that the truth suffered by His refraining from such a vindication. On the contrary, the Cross established truth over falsehood, but it did more, it established love over hate, and exhibited to the world the one sure means

by which the truth could be vindicated without moral loss to mankind.

II.

Can we, then, come to some measure of agreement as to the methods of application? Needless to say, a full consideration of this subject would carry us into every department of life, and involve us in a treatment far beyond the limits of this essay. Nor would it be altogether profitable, for the application in particular cases must be made by individuals. It is not a code of laws we are discussing, but a living principle. What really matters is that we have within us that principle; our whole contention is that, if it be given full play, it will guide us into the kind of conduct which will regenerate society. Let us, however, give some attention to the problem of application in order the better to understand the principles.

(i.) *In private life* we are called upon to check our actions at every point by the principle of love. Our conversation, our expenditure, our domestic life, our business, must come under review, and the ultimate decision as to what is legitimate for us must be determined by love. If we hate war between nations we are compelled to admit that the spirit which makes war finds expression in family hatreds, personal dislikes and grudges, in class envy or contempt. So far as these feelings are given a place within our hearts, or expression in our acts, we are sinning against the light. Even the fundamental presuppositions of all our thinking must be subject to this scrutiny. What is really involved in an acceptance of the principle is a revaluation of life. We speak of things that are

" worth fighting for." If fighting (in the sense of opposing evil with evil) is the surrender of the soul, is anything of this supreme value? What shall a man give in exchange for his own soul? The whole universe which has determined our standards of value is influenced by ideals of self-interest. The " man of the world " has a standard which even the spiritual babe realizes to be false. Spiritual manhood, the state in which we " put away childish things," is based upon a growth, not so much in prophecy, in faith or in knowledge, as in LOVE (~~1 Cor. xiii.~~).

(ii.) *In national life* what vistas open out to us as waiting to be redeemed by the spirit of love. The same spirit which chafes against the war-demon among the nations must seek with a passionate desire for a release from the chains of the present competitive system, from business methods which crush the weakest and reward relentless efficiency, from methods of manufacture which reduce men to machines, from a penal system that scarcely attempts to be remedial, from conditions of life that can hardly fail to destroy both body and soul. What is demanded is, of course, no indiscriminate " charity." It is rather a grouping together of men and women who will apply the principle of love with thoroughness to all these great national problems, relying upon it entirely, and who will be bold enough to make experiments, however hopeless they may seem when judged by the ordinary standards of society. This may have to be done, in the first place, in a small way. There may be many apparent failures as we seek to work out the national life on the basis of love. Those who believe, however,

that we have not only a basis, but the only satisfactory basis for human life in this kind of love, are called upon to try, and to go on trying to apply it. It may be that small communities of those who accept this view of life could achieve more by living and working together than could be done either by individual effort or by attempts at legislative reform. What is supremely required is that, in our relations with one another, we should give the principle of love a fair trial. Whether this would ultimately lead to the elimination of force in the machinery of the State it is, perhaps, impossible to say at the present stage of society. Certainly there are many things which must first be dealt with. As one problem is solved the way to the solution of the next will probably become clear.

(iii.) *In our international relations* we are called upon to think out far more thoroughly what would be involved in a world State whose ultimate sanctions were mutual trust and goodwill as between the component nationalities. Nothing less than this should be our aim. We may be far nearer to it to-day than we realize. There can be no doubt that very many, including especially, perhaps, those who have had personal experience of warfare, will be ready, at the close of this war, to consider any reasonable proposition which can be brought forward with a view to bringing an end to war. It goes without saying that those who agree with the dictum of Bernhardi that the law of love "can claim no significance for the relations of one country to another,"* will not be prepared to accept any such proposals. Our contention, however, is that,

* *Germany and The Next War*, p. 29.

since love is the ultimate force behind the universe, it does actually supply the principle upon which the relations of nations to one another can be determined. The opposite principle has certainly failed lamentably. We might almost say that the European war demonstrates the fact that the principle of force cannot be a satisfactory basis for human society, and is, therefore, not the ultimate principle on which the universe rests. We have tried to erect a civilization which is really grounded on a pagan philosophy of life, and the fact that we call it Christian has blinded many of us to the fact that its fundamental pre-suppositions are utterly un-Christian. This fact has been suddenly revealed to us. Dare we face the consequences? Have we courage and wisdom enough to set about the reconstruction of our international life upon a genuinely Christian basis?

Dr. Liebknecht has indicated the lines along which this might be attempted, although he finds his basis of solidarity in a common class interest rather than in a common human one. Ultimately we must get down to this latter. Why not now? Dr. Liebknecht's words in his protest against the war credit vote by the Reichstag of December 2nd are worthy of the closest attention of all Christian thinkers. He says:

"A rapid peace, one which does not humiliate anybody, a peace without conquests, this is what we demand. Every effort in this direction must be favourably received. The continuous and simultaneous affirmation of this desire, in all the belligerent countries, can alone put a stop to the bloody massacre before the complete exhaustion of all the peoples concerned. A

peace based upon the international solidarity of the working class and on the liberty of all peoples can alone be a lasting peace. It is in this sense that the proletariate of all countries must furnish, even in the course of this war, a Socialist effort for peace."

III.

If anything approaching this vision is to be fulfilled, there remains a task of surpassing difficulty before the men and women who will attempt it. The mind is baffled in its attempt to grasp all that is involved. The stoutest spirit quails as we contemplate the stupendous difficulties. For those who have seen the vision there undoubtedly comes a call to a full dedication to this great ideal. Only as we press forward in this spirit can we understand all that is involved in it. Only thus can we discover the full resources which are available for those who rely completely upon the Power of Love.

The present distress needs, however, nothing less than such an adventure. It is no time for half measures. The world needs a Christianity which is more Christian than anything we have yet seen. In every department of life there is opportunity for the exhibition of fresh and vitalizing power. To quote another great German, Professor Eucken, in his wonderful summary of the present situation:

"The only antidote, then, to the soullessness of modern culture and the starving of all inward life is a return to the deepening and quickening forces of religion. But our statement of the case has shown further that the revival of religion leads direct to Christianity. The world-service which Christianity

has rendered in the building up of a new world and the elevation of mankind is absolutely indispensable for religious progress. The present day, in particular, with its moral slackness, stands in urgent need of rousing and regeneration *through the moral earnestness of Christianity.* In the bosom of Christianity unfathomable forces are slumbering, forces which have by no means lived themselves out, and are still capable of breaking forth again and driving human life into new channels with an irresistible and elemental violence. The contact of divine and human begets daimonic forces which may work either for revolution and renewal or for destruction and desolation. To gain control of these, and lead them into the paths of productive work, is one main task of the religious community. But the particular way of apprehending this task may, in the lapse of time, become narrow and stereotyped. Then arises the need of appealing from it to the primal force itself, and summoning this to a task of new creation."*

What is the primal force? If the Church of Christ has not been mistaken in regarding Jesus of Nazareth as the supreme manifestation of the Father's nature, we can only answer, in the text of our childhood, "God is Love." After all, our whole attitude on this, as on every great question of life, is determined by our conception of God. What is fundamentally responsible for the present failure of civilization is a false or inadequate idea of God. What we need is a truer idea of Him which shall quicken all our thinking and our living. The revival of religion which we so greatly

* *Can we still be Christian?* pp. 211-212. (Italics ours.)

need, therefore, must be a revival in love. How is that to come? Through men and women who have seen a new vision of what love is, and who have committed their lives without reserve to the fulfilment of that vision.

The war spirit will not be stamped out by argument, however cogent and well-expressed. Economic considerations have not proved to have any compelling force. Mere disgust may sicken us of war for a generation, but it cannot encompass its final downfall. The negative protest against its inhumanity and horror has scarcely even availed to ameliorate its conditions, and seems utterly futile in stemming its course.

What is needed is a positive message. If a healing stream could be directed into the morass in which we find ourselves, and if that stream proved to have sprung from a divine source, might not something happen in human life which would both inhibit the power of evil and liberate the powers of good to a degree which we have never dreamed possible?

"From examination of the world as it is, it is rational to conclude that the person, or the community, that followed the promptings of tender-heartedness, totally ignoring the prompting of hard-heartedness, would be swept from the face of the earth. The only consideration that could make all passive and active antagonisms appear iniquitous would be the belief that there was some Power—transcendent, immanent behind the power of human tenderness, a Power that was able, through that instrument, to subdue to world to itself."*

* *The Practice of Christianity*, p. 69.

This is our faith, and nothing less, and, therefore, we may have confidence in our belief not only in the principle of love as the sufficient basis of human society, but also in the power behind that love, if once we trust ourselves fully to it, to overcome the unspeakable obstacles that lie in our path, and to break forth again and drive "human life into new channels with elemental violence."

Once in the history of the world there was found a Man who wholly trusted to the ultimate victory of love. All through His life He refused to use any means which love could not sanctify. He went calmly forward along a path which He well discerned, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left, although before Him lay a death of shame. This life and this death have liberated in the world greater forces for good than any other life and death in all the centuries before or since; they have meant more for human progress than has been achieved by all the armies and fleets the world has seen. Men in every nation are still willing to be conquered by such love, and still resist to the last drop of blood all the efforts to conquer them by force of arms. Where are the men and women who will forsake the method which has failed so dismally, and accept to the full the method which has proved its success?

HENRY T. HODGKIN.

IV

THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS WITHIN YOU

THERE may be times when prayer seems an appeal to God to do something which we ought to do ourselves, times when the apocalyptic hope of the Kingdom seems fevered and mistaken. It is not so now. We are at the end of our resources. The calamity which has befallen Europe threatens to become one of the darkest nights of human history, not only because of the physical suffering involved, but because of the spiritual eclipse which has overtaken so many of our noblest hopes and beliefs. With that inextinguishable hope which is the sign of the Divine in us, at first men dreamed that all kinds of things might be wrought through the war ; the ending of war, the destruction of militarism, the renovation of society, the return of faith. But as time wears on, as the story unfolds day by day, hope recedes and the conviction is forced upon us that from the war itself we can expect nothing good. The heritage of hate and suspicion will outlast more than our generation, the general appeal to force will for years to come make any other appeal impossible, if the war brings in its train social regeneration it will be different from most of the wars known to history. It no longer seems otiose to pray ; it is all there is left us to do. It is no longer wrong to expect God to

intervene ; there is no hope anywhere else. We are in one of those times when apocalyptic seems the only sanity.

But we ought to have learnt something of God's ways by this time, enough at least to know how the Kingdom is to come and what we ought to pray for ; and it seems clear from history that the Kingdom comes in power and glory when men's hearts and the will of God are united. Our apocalyptic ought not to be fevered and wild, but calm and sure. It is with this thought upon our minds that we remember the word of the Lord : The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation, for the Kingdom of God is within you.

The idea of the Kingdom as " within " is so rare in our Gospels, and the apocalyptic interpretation of Christ's idea of the Kingdom is so dominant that it is no wonder that this statement that the Kingdom is within us is widely questioned. It is contended that the original can be translated with equal validity : " The Kingdom is among you " ; and since the words were addressed to the Pharisees this seems more in accordance with the context. The meaning of our Lord would then be that the Kingdom was present in Himself, and the saying would be parallel with that other word : " If I by the finger of God cast out demons then is the Kingdom of God come upon you." But even thus translated the text seems to stand outside the apocalyptic idea of the Kingdom, since it distinctly denies that the Kingdom comes with observation or " outward show." This is, however, agreed to be quite a wrong translation. The word which has been interpreted to mean outward show really means close observation, and is used with

reference to watching both the signs of an illness and the movements of the heavenly bodies. It clearly means that the coming of the Kingdom is not predictable, and the declaration that it is present among us may mean that it is present in potentiality, ready to break forth when there is faith to receive it.

Very few of us have any remaining irritation with apocalyptic hopes at such a time as this. If the war is in any sense one of the indispensable preludes to the further coming of the Kingdom, the prelude is apocalyptic enough. We have to turn to long neglected passages in Biblical literature to find language adequate to describe the conditions that prevail and the feelings and fears which hold our minds. In the face of the present time, all soft idealisms, all distant far-off events, all slow and evolutionary processes seem a mockery and only revolt us. God has some greater thing than this, if we were ready for it. Yet it would be of practical helpfulness if we could find just now some reconciliation of these differing views of the Kingdom; that it is apocalyptic, that it did come in Christ, and that it is an inward possession whenever and however it comes. This seems rather a forlorn hope in view of the extraordinary stubbornness of opposing schools of interpretation, but it may be that the opposition is due to the very great content of the idea in the mind of Christ, and we are in times when oppositions are breaking down through the recovery of simplicity and depth of thought. Let us therefore take these apparently opposed ideas in order, beginning with that which has become so dominant within the last few years.

THE APOCALYPTIC KINGDOM

If we remove our concern for a moment from the Gospels, where controversy still centres, to the pre-Christian apocalyptic, we shall find ourselves moving among less ambiguous ideas. If we take Apocalyptic, as represented by the Book of Enoch, we shall find that the hope of the Kingdom embraces three lines of expectation. It is expected that the coming of the Kingdom will be heralded by great upheavals in the natural order, by great national or political disturbances, and shall come finally in a supernatural revelation: a manifestation of God in an actual theophany, or in the coming of the Son of Man. Now in our revolt from the watering down of these ideas, with which liberalism is charged, we may swing to the opposite extreme, and forget that the writers of these books turned to symbolism as their most natural medium of expression, that they were more spiritual and educated than has often been supposed, so that to interpret their writings in a bald, literal and physical sense is to do them a great injustice. Moreover, their symbolism was deliberately adopted, lest the real significance of their message should be detected by hostile authorities. If they referred to kingdoms and empires under the form of various beasts, " the clouds of the heaven," " the Son of Man," or " the sea," may be equally symbolical. What we must be careful about is that in all effort to appreciate their thought for our own purposes we shall conserve what was integral to their scheme of things, and we may set this out for our guidance somewhat as follows :

(1) God is supreme over all worlds, the natural, the national and the spiritual. It must be remembered that they did not *predict* national upheavals, they were actually living through them, but it was their unquenchable faith that no upheaval unseats God from His throne, or frustrates so much as fulfils His purpose. (2) Apocalyptic had, however, moved from expectation of deliverance through the natural order to a definite belief that the great epiphany was to be wrought within humanity. This is the significance of Daniel's dream of a kingdom of humanity and its individualisation, in the Book of Enoch, in the Son of Man. Some similar idea, no doubt, underlies Paul's conception of the Man from Heaven, the Last Adam. A new man, a new race of men, is the means by which God is going to redeem the world. (3) But it is also integral to their thought that in this new evolution of humanity it shall be perfectly clear that it is a definite work of God. The Son of Man shall come with the clouds of Heaven, he shall be brought near to God, he shall be one of God's great new creations.

Now Jesus shared in a vivid though definitely spiritual form the hopes of the apocalyptic writers; but it would be blind to credit His mind with a belief in anything that could be characterised as mere power, pompous or coercive. Fortunately we have examples of how He believed apocalyptic was actually fulfilled. When the disciples returned and reported how the demons were subject to them, He said, "I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven." On another occasion He declared that Elijah had returned in

power and spirit in the person and work of John the Baptist. Whatever we may believe to be the picture He cherished of His own return, nothing can alter the fact that He said, over and over again, that He would come through others, through little children, through His disciples, through the needy and distressed, in such nearness and actuality, that any service done to them would be a service done to Himself. But it is the ideas which we found to be integral to the apocalyptic mind that remain with Jesus. He believed that the Kingdom would be a recognisable work of God, that it would operate on the historical, that is to say, the human sphere, and that it would satisfy all the hopes of it which men of olden time had expressed.

THE KINGDOM COME IN CHRIST

Christ's amazing reticence about His own personality cannot conceal the fact that He believed the Kingdom to be intimately connected with His own person and work, in other words, that in Himself the Kingdom was already established, so that in the future His coming and the coming of the Kingdom are identical. It is not, therefore, in what He tells us concerning Himself, but in the words which slip out without intention of revealing Himself, that betray the deepest consciousness of His mind. We know that His will was in perfect correspondence with that of the Father, not because He said so in so many words, but because this is assumed as the basis of all His teaching. It was from this inner consciousness that there sprang His Gospel, and the fact that it was His own experience

He offered to men gave His gospel a power which operated as it was spoken. This experience gave Him power over the hearts of men, and enabled Him to look forward to the future history of the world as His supreme domain. This has been steadfastly maintained by the Church in all ages. What has not been so well understood is wherein He conceived that knowledge and power to consist. His knowledge we may denote as ethical and practical rather than mystical and speculative. It is by doing and being certain things that men come, not to an external, theological knowledge of God, but to actual likeness to God, the very consummation of knowledge. He knows because He is neither worldly-wise nor calculatingly prudent. He knows as the child knows, because He is willing to be led and willing to go on without counting the cost. It is moral knowledge obtained by moral action from within. His power also is different from what passes for power in this world. It is found in His lowliness and meekness, in His capacity for service and in His willingness to sacrifice. If He is lifted up He will draw all men to Him, and the exaltation that will give Him power is the exaltation on the Cross. He obtains His power over the hearts of men by divesting Himself of all the ways to obtain power that prevail among the conquerors and demagogues of this world. He smiles at our impressive dignity and consents to hang on the Cross naked and shameful. He will have no lording it over others for the sake of being called a Benefactor, He casts away the sword and trusts only to the piercing power of love. And in all this He knows the Kingdom has come. This *is* the Kingdom ; it brings peace and

joy to Himself, it can renovate the world and it is a sufficient basis for human society. The Beatitudes promise blessedness. They are absolute because that blessedness Christ Himself knew; the Beatitudes are true of Himself; He is blessed because He is pure in heart, He possesses the Kingdom because He is poor in spirit, He will inherit the earth because He is meek. It is this precious gift that He gives to the world. He passes it on by His life of service, by His bearing of our sufferings, sicknesses and sins, and, at last, by letting the full force of this new love meet, overcome all other forces, and break out in glorious fullness through His broken heart. It is plain that Jesus believed that the Kingdom would come in glory as the result of His yielding Himself to death, and that this would produce those effects which we have come to call apocalyptic, revealing, redemptive, recreative. We must keep strongly in mind that Jesus held these two things—the inward and the apocalyptic—together as not incompatible, but the one as the actual consequence of the other. That will help us to carry through to the next idea without any diminution of what we have so far gained.

THE KINGDOM WITHIN

The Kingdom comes first in human experience and, as it comes, everywhere brings upheaval, deliverance and reconstruction. Christ has this experience, and this He can communicate whenever He can secure personal attachment to and absolute trust in Himself. Nothing less than this personal connection can bear the full transmission of His secret, for it cannot be told,

or spread as an unconscious influence, at least in its depth and power; it depends upon personal communication. The essentiality of Christ's personality to the Kingdom of God is not arbitrary nor due to personal dogmatic claims; it is in the nature of our humanity.

It is when we come to this point that we can see the almost complete reconciliation of the progressive and apocalyptic, the ethical and the eschatological ideas of the Kingdom. We need not quarrel over terms like "breaking in," or "emerging from." They are both only and inadequately descriptive of transcendental and yet immediate realities. God may be with us all the time; we can hardly conceive Him popping in and out of His world for the sake of producing a sort of Jack-in-the-box surprise. Of all such ideas the immanentist is rightly scornful. But we must also remember that God has so constructed the world of human nature, and has so purposed the progress of His Kingdom, that there are certain things He cannot do until humanity is ready for them. It may only need a psychological change in us to recognize things that have always been there, but the recognition may make a cataclysmic difference, as those conversions which are largely psychological show. It is the expectation of things vastly different and actually out-running our hopes that we have got to allow room for in the economy of God. Such changes Jesus traced, however, to an ethical seat in the mind. "The Kingdom is at hand," He declares; then comes the command, "Repent." A great repentance would be apocalyptic in its results. It would bring the assurance of God

home to men and it would revolutionize our life in such a way as to bring the heavenly Jerusalem down to earth.

Now it is not fantastic and unsupported to cherish such a possibility for our own times. Looking back on history we can see such changes actually wrought in the thinking and lives of men; for instance, at Pentecost, in the Franciscan movement, in the Wesleyan revival; and the thrill has not faded from the records of them or the impulse quite died down after all these years. But we are now thrown suddenly upon one of the hours of darkness, and if we have anything to learn from history it is that these precede new revelations, not of mechanical necessity, but because they throw men back upon God alone.

We have gathered ourselves together (for the time separate somewhat from our nation and from our Churches, though believing that by so doing we are yielding them the highest service), because it is borne in upon us that the things in which men have trusted and in which they are still trusting have already shown themselves bankrupt. Slowly but surely trust in diplomacy, force, and economic pressure will be brought to nought. Another way has to be found, and although we are a collection of mere nobodies, without much knowledge of the forces of this world or the ways of God, we feel we are called to find a better way. We are sure that there are many things that we dare not pray for, such as the victory that is obtained by force and which therefore means the destruction of humanity and the substitution for years to come of real faith in God. But we believe that we can cry for

God to make the way of His salvation plain to men. We cannot, would not, attempt to dictate the way. His power is not exhausted: something beyond our experience or imagination is possible; something beyond human experience and the hopes of most seems necessary. We may seem to others to take a negative position. We cannot believe war is the right way, while at present we cannot show them concretely any other way. But this does not mean that we are without definite expectation as to the way the Kingdom must come. The Kingdom which came in Christ is not simply the reinforcement of a blank hope, an undefinable expectation. There must be a great repentance of humanity, there must be the setting forth of a new order of life which shall be an act of faith in God and a great adventure upon the powers of love, and the willingness to pay the price of persecution, failure or death.

When we think of this we look into our own hearts with the greatest possible fear and shrinking. We know that before we can find any such way we have to change radically. Something in us that has long hindered the working of God usward has got to give way, there has to be almost a transmutation of our own consciousness, so much is there that needs to be shut down in our minds of fear, calculation, prudence and self-concern, and such a deeper entrance of Christ in regnant power and complete filling is needed if we are to know something of the experience which caused Paul to declare that henceforth he did not live so much as Christ lived in him. We look round upon one another, and our habitual criticism and even contempt

of one another does not help to lift our hopes. And then we think of Christ and the Twelve, of the upper room and the little company of believers, who hardly knew what they believed and certainly did not know how to tell it to the world, until like a mighty rushing wind and like tongues of flame the Spirit came; and we know wherein is all our hope. Therefore we pray as we have never prayed before:

Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done in *us* as it is in heaven.

And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service.

For the sake of our beloved land,

For the sake of the broken body and outpoured blood of our stricken humanity,

For the sake of the Holy Kingdom and its coming on the earth.

In fellowship with Thy sufferings;
By identification with Thy Cross and Passion;
By the power of Thy resurrection;
In union with Thy ascended and glorified Humanity;
O Lord Christ, Master, Saviour, Light of the World, Desire of the Nations, Healer of our Divisions;
Our Peace;
Our only Hope. AMEN.

W. E. ORCHARD.

V

CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILISATION

CHRISTIANITY and civilization. How easily the words slip off our lips, how natural and how inevitable seem the conjunction of ideas! We all know that civilization is to be found at its highest among the nations of Western Europe, and that all these nations are known to the world as Christian nations. And if this is true of Western Europe as a whole, does it not seem still more true when we apply the words to England, to Christian England? Those who have had the good fortune to pass their early years in an English village, will remember how their village was to them a microcosm of their country. With childlike faith we believed that the blessings born of Christianity and of civilization were plainly witnessed in our little village. All of us were civilized, and nearly all of us were Christians. Outside the pale of Christianity stood a few notorious characters who drank and gambled, one or two educated men whose crime it was to have thought too much about Christianity, while in addition there was a doubtful fringe of Nonconformists whom we knew were outside the Church, and whom we half believed were outside Christianity. Each year we had a Foreign Mission meeting, with England painted red upon the map and heathendom black, and

we were asked to give our money and our prayers towards helping to send the blessings of Christian civilization to the dark places of heathendom.

Some of us can remember the shock of surprise when we first read such books as "The Letters of John Chinaman," by Mr. Lowes Dickinson. It was clear to us that there was something wrong with either Christianity or civilization, and our first impulse was to throw the blame upon Christianity. We found it hard to believe in a religion which, after two thousand years, had produced such sorry results as this English civilization of ours. And it was only gradually that we won our way through to see that the way of life which Christ had held up before men was harder, and the ideals of the Sermon on the Mount less easy of attainment than we had believed. We realized that we had only been able to call ourselves a Christian nation by sacrificing much of what was best in Christianity, and that Christianity had only become an "established" religion by its willingness to compromise with the world. This was the lesson which was brought home to some of us at the great Conference of the Student Christian Movement at Liverpool, that the Christians in England were still a small handful to whom had been entrusted the task of converting to Christianity not only heathendom but European civilization as well.

The more closely we examine Christian civilization in the light of the Gospels the more clearly do we see that its basis is not Christian but pagan. I use the word "pagan" not to express contempt—it would be hard indeed to feel contempt for Periclean Athens

or the age of Marcus Aurelius—but simply and solely by way of contrast with the word " Christian," and I wish to select a few instances of our modern way of life which cannot, by any possible stretch of language, be called Christian.

We should all agree that competition plays a very great part in our modern civilization, and that a great amount of our industrial life would be impossible apart from competition. Competition, as we know, is a very large and difficult subject, and it would clearly be impossible to deal with the whole of it adequately in the present paper. There may be something very healthy and bracing in the spirit of emulation, something which could not be eradicated without a great national loss. But there are certain elements in competition which cannot by any conceivable means be squared with the Sermon on the Mount, and it is these elements to which I wish to call attention.

Let me take just a few of the inevitable results of the present system of competition. Here is a small village grocer faced by the competition of a newcomer, or a married clerk threatened with the rivalry of an unmarried clerk, ready to work at a lower salary. The new grocer and the unmarried clerk are both ready to deprive their rival of livelihood, and, perhaps, even send him to the workhouse. Can this be squared with the teaching of the Gospels, which tells us that love is the true way of life ? Or again here is a Trade Union over against a Masters' Federation. Both want to secure the maximum amount of the surplus profits, and both are ready to resort to the strike or lock-out to secure their ends. Can anyone who has mixed with

either masters or men at the time of a strike say honestly that love is the guiding principle of life at such a time? Or again here is a model firm known for its philanthropy and its care for its workers. Side by side with it are a number of smaller firms. The heads of this model firm know quite well that the cheaper the goods they produce and the better the quality the more inevitably must they ruin other firms which have less capital and which may be also less competent. Can their action towards these smaller firms in any true sense be said to be guided by love? The utmost that can be said is that these employers are involved in a hateful dilemma, and that to ruin smaller rivals is the lesser of two evils.

If we look the competition system fairly in the face, we shall see that it is a system which forces men at times to ruin or to do harm to their neighbours, and at other times to hate or to provoke hatred, and we shall see too that a country cannot be called Christian so long as its civilization is based, to a large degree, upon the system of competition. It is quite as difficult for a business man to compete with his rivals and really love them as it is for a soldier to shoot his enemies and really love them. Much of modern competition is a kind of warfare with hypocrisy thrown in, and thousands of business men who have enlisted breathe a sigh of relief at exchanging a dishonest for an honest system of warfare.

The competitive system is unchristian, not only because it is the negation of love, but also because it allows no room for faith in man as the child of God. Few people are satisfied with the present competitive

system, but they defend it on the ground that it is the only way in which the work of the world can be satisfactorily performed. This defence takes two forms. In the first place it is said that one could not get the "clever and able" people to put forward their best efforts unless we allowed them the opportunity of making more money and gaining greater power or fame than their neighbours. In the second place it is said that we could not get the "dull and ordinary" people to do all the dull, distasteful and mechanical work unless we forced them to it by fear of dismissal or starvation.

Such a defence leaves no room whatever for the Christian conception of vocation. If God has given to all men certain talents which are to be used for the good of mankind, the Christian should need no other stimulus than this, and the desire to serve the community should be strong enough to call forth his utmost powers. So long as a great deal of work is directed to making wasteful, luxurious, useless articles, so long will it be impossible for the Christian conception of vocation to find play. But if once the man going into business asked himself first and foremost "Is this the work which will give the truest play to my talents? Is this the work which is most needed for the community?" we should find ourselves at the beginning of a revolution in our modern system of industrial life which would, in time, sweep away all work that was not for the real good of the community. If we are Christian we must believe that the true motive for work is neither the desire for wealth nor the fear of dismissal, but the sense of vocation which has so far

been almost entirely confined to the missionary, the social worker and the preacher.

Our present civilization is pagan because it allows no place for the Christian conception of the body corporate in which where one member suffers all the members suffer with it. In our family life we show all the best and greatest pagan virtues (virtues which are also Christian), love of parents, love of wife and love of children, a readiness on the part of parents to sacrifice themselves for their children, and of children to sacrifice themselves for their parents. But we still believe for the most part that our duty stops with our family or our employees or our neighbours. If we had really believed in the body corporate we should long ago have waged a national war upon poverty. And what of our attitude towards the failures of life, towards the undeserving, the casuals or the misfits? We have so little sensitiveness towards them that we cannot even weep for them, much less brace ourselves up to a national effort to secure that the whole body should be sound.

And if we find it hard to realize that the nation is really a brotherhood, how infinitely harder do we find it to include other nations in the body corporate. Even the best of us find it hard to believe that the growth of German prosperity is also to the good of ourselves. It is the envy and hatred of other nations which lie at the root of all Protective systems, just as it is the belief of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of mankind which must inevitably lead, in due time, to the federation of the world.

As a nation, too, we are still far from believing that

the body corporate must include all women as well as men. It is the fear and jealousy of woman which lies at the root of much of the opposition to the women's movement, and our whole conception of the need of war as a stimulant to life is based upon the denial of women as part of the body corporate. If we had any sense of social sympathy, we could not talk so lightly of punishing a nation for its breach of a treaty when in that punishment is included the sufferings of millions of German women whose only fault is that they loved their husbands and their sons too well.

Lastly our present civilization is pagan because it is based upon the belief that the physical is stronger than the spiritual. Take, for instance, our relation, if we happen to be employers, to people around us, to our workmen, to our waiters, to our typists and our servants. Do we not all of us trust more to coercion, and to the threat of dismissal, than to any spiritual appeal? It seems so easy to get work out of people by the threat of sacking them, and so hard to do it by the weapons of the spirit. And both in socialism and in social reform it is so easy to fall into the ways of the world and pin our faith to ballot boxes and majorities just because they are simple and easy methods. It is because we live in a pagan community that we hardly ever even think of the possibility of converting the minority instead of coercing it. In our temperance work it is easy to work for total prohibition, but far harder to win over to our side one individual brewer or even one workman who believes in his glass of beer, but who can doubt which of these ways would be nearer to the mind of Christ? We need more faith in God

and less faith in majorities. We need more faith in human nature because of the divine that is indwelling within it. There is a close connection between cynicism and coercion. If we have no faith in people we shall find it necessary to use coercion, but if we really believe in other people, if we really trust in them, we shall find that in very truth love is the all-sufficient basis of human society.

It is just because we have learned to believe in force in our own internal life that we have acquiesced so long in methods of diplomacy abroad which are based upon the ultimate appeal to the sword. We have had no faith in other countries, and no belief in spiritual conversion. If we had believed as much in the conversion of Germany as we have done, let us say, in the conversion of China, we should have spent the last seven years in ways very different from the diplomatic exchanges and notes which are only at best a disguised form of warfare.

The great lesson to be remembered is that the spirit which finds expression in war is only a part of the same spirit which finds expression in other spheres of our civilization. The normal business man spends about seven-tenths of his whole time at his business, and if his relation to his neighbours is not based upon the law of love, it is not surprising that the same absence of love should be found in his relationship to other nations. In so far as peace propaganda has hitherto failed, it has been because we have tried to isolate peace from the other aspects of love. We cannot have a special compartment for peace, any more than we can have a special compartment for Sunday

Christianity. We cannot preach peace unless we are prepared to live in ways of peace, and the sincerity of our daily lives will be the most effective means of peace propaganda. The fact is that it is harder to preach peace than we thought that it was. We had hoped that we could go on with our ordinary pagan lives and graft peace on to this. Now we are finding that we cannot preach peace unless our daily thoughts are thoughts of love, and our daily works are works of love. The disciples could preach peace because they had given up all and followed Christ, and the world could not help but believe in their sincerity.

In order to preach peace effectively we need to have our eyes opened to see the challenge which the teaching of Christ gives to the whole of our existing social life and social order. We need to be driven back to a sense of repentance in our own lives which have fallen so far short of the ideal, and the war will then appear in its true perspective as nothing more than a focussing point for the general call to repentance to which the shame of our whole social order calls us. Many of us learned our first real lesson in repentance when the war broke out last August, and when there broke out within us that feeling of shame and remorse for a civilization whose fruits were witnessed in a war between the great civilized and Christian powers. We might have learned this feeling of shame and repentance long ago by the sight of our own social disorders at home, but for some of us there was needed the awful lesson of war to bring this feeling home in all its fullness. And we have learned, too, during the last few months, something more of the need for God in the world.

Many of us have been engaged in little actions which we knew to be useful, and we have found that our strength was sufficient for success. Then came the war, and our brain reeled as we thought of Servia and Turkey, Poland and Russia, and all the millions of warring individuals. We felt our own powerlessness, and we were driven back to God.

In face not only of this war, but of all the great and vast disorders of life, we know now that we are powerless without God and invincible with Him. The sense has come to us that we are called to be the army of God, that our warfare is to be a warfare with spiritual weapons, and our goal the conversion of civilization to Christ. For this task we need humility and heroism, and the words of Christ ringing in our ears: "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."

J. St. G. Heath.

VI

PERSONALITY AND WAR

WAR'S GLORY AND ITS CRIME

THERE are very few who do not feel some dubiety of conscience at the present time, and even those who have no scruple of conscience are aware of a problem. The finest blood of the nations is being poured out; the physique of the West is bound to deteriorate; and many whose soul and experience are needed to help in the solution of the world's problems will never return from the strife that will determine the outward conditions of life.

Do we not feel that this immolation of persons is a crime? Can it be justified unless we lower the value of personality? It seems to us that in counting principles as possessing absolute* value, we have forgotten that souls also possess the same. That the first is true, and universally acclaimed, is all to the good, but that the second is not realised is one of the saddest things that war brings to light. It is the purpose of this paper to show that each person must have an absolute value in himself; otherwise there is no value at all in the world. You can never create value

* The term "absolute" is used instead of the technically more correct term "infinite," as it better conveys the meaning to the ordinary reader.

out of a number of cyphers by any arrangement of them, however varied. Personality, if it possesses worth, must possess it intrinsically. If the soul has no value humanity has none.

It is impossible for principles (honour, truth, justice, etc.) to have an absolute value apart from the absolute value of the spiritual person, for they do not exist except in relation to beings whose principles they are. Principles apart from the soul have no existence ; the soul apart from principles has no meaning. If this is true, then in all our actions we must realise the absolute value of the individual soul ; and to those souls who are not conscious of their own meaning and purpose, we must act so as to enable them to realise it, that is, we must act redemptively. We may begin by stating what is, for us, a principle, namely that

THE SOUL GIVES VALUE TO THE WORLD, AND IT IS THE ONLY THING OF ABSOLUTE WORTH IN THE WORLD.

The word "soul" is used, instead of "person," because of the connotation which it brings to the religious mind, but it is perhaps as well to define that in this paper "soul" stands for a reasoning, loving and free being. It is the soul that gives worth to science. Science concerns itself with the material order,—that is to say, with the conditions of life, but its quest would not be begun, nor its results ever attained, much less have meaning, were it not for the soul. When we are told that an impersonal desire for truth, and openness to fact, is the first condition of scientific research, we are only being told that the soul never can arrive at truth unless it is open to the

impact of reality. Here we have stress laid upon an attitude without which the soul itself cannot find its true meaning, which meaning is never found in its mere individuality, but in itself as social, as a member of a universal society, having what is disinterested and universal in its heart.* But that universal society has no meaning apart from the meaning of each soul; the key to the one is the key to the other; and science is infinitely lowered if it is merely concerned with the discovery of the conditions for lives which have no ultimate meaning. The truth is, that every scientific discovery is a personal attainment and a personal realisation.

It is the soul also that gives value to philosophy. To analyse knowledge, to investigate the laws of mind, and to discover the meaning of the world, is like working at a jig-saw puzzle, the value of which disappears with its accomplishment, unless meanings are relative to what is living, permanent and immortal, that is to say, the soul. We often fail to realise that thought is an activity of a person. Its universal character comes because souls are essentially the same, the meaning of each is the meaning of all; without others we are not made perfect. Thought is timeless, we own; but also meaningless apart from beings that are not essentially conditioned by time. Thought is the law of our true life, and the unfolding of the purpose for which we are to be active. The vision of the object is

* A person, being a self-conscious rational being, unites, in virtue of self-consciousness and self-activity, on the one hand, and reason on the other, what is individual and universal. It is as true to say that "personality is a receptivity for the Other" as to say "it involves also a consciousness of self."

also the self-realisation of the subject. The deepening of our knowledge of the world is also the enrichment of the soul.

It is the same with art. The form of an object may evoke the sense of beauty, but the sense of beauty is in the soul, not in the object, and the object is purposive in order to evoke the soul. It is the same in music :

> Music, when soft voices die,
> Vibrates in the memory.

All works of art are self-expressions ; that they touch what is universal and not merely individual is a revelation of the greatness and the meaning of the soul, which finds itself in that which it has in common with other souls. The end of art is a living disposition towards life, without which life's moral attainment would lack both delicacy and warmth.

In the æsthetic sphere it is, however, the sublime which supremely unfolds the soul's meaning.* "A clear night of stars," which is the calm vision of immensity, or the storm-tossed ocean, beneath the racing clouds which embody the fury of heaven's voice, evoke the soul. Beside its might we are as nothing ; but if that were all, to call it sublime would be foolish, it could only be called horrible in its formless and destructive fury. But we call it sublime, for it awakens us to a sense of our true nature and destiny. It may overwhelm but it cannot conquer us ; its greatness is that of force, ours that of spirit. Our true being is ever beyond its grasp ; it can never touch what we

* For the analysis of the sublime *vide* Kant's "Kritik of Judgment."

really are. Our destiny is super-sensible; we are the children of a spiritual and immortal world. We have in this the reason why all heroisms inspire us. They are the unfoldings of our world and of our meaning. It may be that we cannot see our meaning without some such experience as this. To say this is to give struggle its worth, and to admit that trial is at once discipline and attainment.

It will not be denied that at the heart of religion lies the judgment of the soul's absolute worth; for religion involves the reaction of the individual on the Universe as a whole, and while the soul, conscious of its utter dependence, seeks for shelter, it still expresses, in that search, its own as well as the Divine sense of its worth.

These considerations lead us to assert the absolute value of the soul, because that which gives worth to the world must have in itself an ultimate value, and that this fact is unconsciously acknowledged is seen in the sense of individual and social responsibility, in the conception of justice and in the very idea of morality. We might have custom without the belief that the individual soul has an infinite worth, but morality has no meaning without this. The moral law has two sides, first that we should act with constant reference to the ideal world, and secondly, that we should treat each person as an end in himself. All the immoralities can be classified as violations of this principle, and all the commands of conscience are relative to a universal world of souls, each of which has absolute worth.

It is a very partial and short-sighted judgment that

isolates war from the present social system. War is the fever which is the outcome of society's disease, the delirium caused not only by the presence of that which means death, but by the opposition to it of that which means life. The cause of war lies deep; one might as well try to cure a cancer with sticking-plaster as to think that the mere cry of "Peace!" and the mere stopping of any one war will bring help to humanity. The fact is that the present social system very largely denies the worth of the individual soul, and it denies this no less in its assertion of selfish individualism than in the creation of its slaves. Its charities involve beggaries, its sovereignties sycophants. We are all born into this heritage. It is easy to be critical and abusive, but we need to be humble, sympathetic and constructive. Ours is the burden, ours is the sin, and ours also is the hope. Blatant self-righteousness itself involves a system of slaveries, for all our contempts are denials of worth, and involve our regarding others as beneath us. We have to be thankful, amid all our sorrow, that war has brought to light so clearly the great human problem, and it is evident that if this problem is ever to find answer we must take it up at those points which are manifest, and seek for the great solution by first solving those things on which the soul has light. That is why we begin with war. It is a manifest injustice. The penalty for its cause is never properly equated, innocence suffers with guilt, and more often than not the guilty stand to gain and not to lose. Men are not treated as free, but as machines, and war is justifiable on a mechanical, but never on a rational view of the

Universe. Those who assert its right also acknowledge its wrong. To do right and wrong at the same time cannot possibly have a final justification. It has in it rather the demand for another solution. That solution will be helped by fair analysis, but never by a blind uncritical yielding to the shouting of the crowd. Moreover, because at the present stage the foreign diplomacies of the nation are secret, and the crowd is at the mercy of those who throw to it mere crumbs of data on which to form a judgment involving life and death, the danger is the more acute.

We enter upon our analysis, keeping in mind the results at which we have arrived. We have to find out what is the glory of war, for, like everything else in this world, it is kept alive not by its evil but by its good. We have also to find out what is its crime, and then to ask ourselves if there is any other solution to the problem which it seeks to solve.

THE GLORY OF WAR

The glory of war lies in two things. It asserts (*a*) the absolute value of principle, that it is something worth dying for, and that a world without it is not worth living in. (*b*) It also asserts personality as social, and rightly denies that the individual soul can live for itself. We have said before that the soul, without principle, has no meaning. To live without principle is not to live as a man, but to exist as a part of unspiritual Nature. A rational person must, in exercising reason, go out from himself to find his own meaning in the meaning of the whole. A soul with a capacity of loving never finds itself save as denying

itself; it lives in other souls and for them. The crowning glory of a man is his freedom, but his freedom is never attained until he is prepared to surrender the world that is seen for the world that is eternal. All selfishness is slavery. In asserting the individual as such, it always asserts him as bound by earthly comforts and material interests, as being driven by feeling, custom, circumstance,—that is to say, as a slave. We find our lives by losing them. We only prove our worth when we live for others. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone." "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it."

At the same time we must realise that there is no such thing as self-sacrifice as such; it is always a form of self-expression and self-realisation. It has such a moral glamour about it that it is the cause, not only of a great deal of blindness, but of not a little hypocrisy. A mother, dying for her child, asserts her motherhood; to fail to make that venture would be to fail to assert herself as mother. The things that are sacrificed are things and not soul. We have to realise that what is called self-sacrifice is not always noble. It is possible to identify oneself with malice and to die because of it. It is possible to identify oneself with indifference to life and to throw one's life as chaff to the winds. It is possible to identify oneself with a worldly power which can mould the outward circumstances of one's fellows and to die in seeking its attainment. It is common to identify oneself with the lust of gold and to lose one's soul to find it. For all these and many other objects we can selfishly sacrifice ourselves. Self-sacrifice is only true when it is un-

selfish, and it cannot be unselfish unless it is spiritual, that is, unless we assert our own spiritual value by identifying ourselves with that which is truly good for others, and apprehending their absolute worth, living and dying for them. All other self-sacrifices identify us with material conditions, assert our slavery as men, and deny our worth as spiritual and rational persons. Such self-deception goes very far. There is hardly a human being who would not like to be a hero. To venture everything to be called a hero is to be unheroic, for it is a selfish self-assertion, having at its heart the desire for praise. Many are willing either to be on the crest of the wave of popular applause, or in the pillory of popular contempt. But the real hero is one who, unconscious of self, accepts his life from God, and in humble courage sees that which is invisible and lives for it.

All true heroism moves us. We Britons think of that ancient Briton, Caractacus, a savage perhaps, but a hero, bearing himself proudly, though in chains, before the Roman Emperor, refusing to buy the existence of a slave at the expense of his manhood. He had identified himself with something larger than his own earthly existence—his tribe and his higher self.

I wonder what the world would be without Thermopylæ? That little Spartan handful waited in the pass for the unnumbered host of Persia. All hope was gone; their country was lost to them, but not their freedom. In sublimity, and all unconsciously, they asserted the spiritual nature and destiny of their souls, as in the victory of the spirit they rose from their ashes. Persia smote the body, but there was

something that she could not touch. When shall we realise that freedom is not the power to use outward conditions, but to make a spiritual assertion, to be oneself over against the world? When shall we realise that this freedom can be destroyed by no invasion, by no altering of State boundaries or change of governments? Those Spartans thought they were dying for their country. Had they understood the full meaning of their heroism they would have seen that they were vindicating the spiritual value of humanity. And so it is at the present time. We yield to none in homage to the brave; we bare our heads as we see men going, giving up home and wife and children, with no desire to slay, but only to preserve the good they see, shelter the weak, and leaven earth's laws with honour. But it were to fail to read the meaning of their actions if we did not see the vision which they reveal, and in that vision see a better way for humanity. We hold no brief for the slaves that cry "Peace!" for reasons of comfort. The only motive that will ever justify the actions of spiritual men must have in it the eternal word which lies behind the sentence: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul."

We cannot, however, rest here, for while we were made for freedom, we were also made to evoke it in others. While we were meant to be superior to the world we were meant to find the way in which it can be ordered by freedom, and for the free. There is no way, except that, which will bring men to spiritual manhood and the fellowship of the spirit. We may organise and legislate as we like, but we shall never

solve the problem by mere outward construction ; we must find the spirit that can create the body.

We contend therefore that war, while having much in it that is true and grand, is no solution, and not only so, but that it veils those elements which would lead to a solution. This leads us to consider :

THE CRIME OF WAR

Its defect is that it is one-sided. It may, through some of the units that take part, express a sacrifice that is spiritual, but it does not evoke what is spiritual in those who are in opposition, for if it did there would be peace. The soul has an absolute value ; but its true expression and its true activity are only found in evoking others to their true life. We are not acting reasonably unless we are so acting as to convince others of what is reasonable. We are not acting in love unless our action is calculated to awaken love. Our freedom is a menace to freedom unless we are calling out the freedom of others. There is only one thing worthy of spiritual beings, and that is to construct, to redeem, to awaken in men's hearts the sense of their heritage as souls. This, because it is an individual matter, cannot be achieved by war ; life is created by life, personality by personality. The spiritual can only be conveyed through a love that finds individual expression, through a charity that is superior to individual malice and resentment. We never truly overcome our enemy until we slay the enmity. We cannot slay enmity with enmity, nor reduce our enemy to love by force. Mass methods are hopeless for this task of redeeming souls, and therefore for redeeming society.

Most of us do not deny the necessity for a civic police system. Such a system may conceivably be redemptive of the criminal while it aims at protecting the weak. The true method of treating crime has yet to be discovered, but the point is that it may be individual and therefore redemptive, and to use it as a justification for war is deplorable logic, for it is to argue from the individual to the universal. On the face of it, war is an attempt to take life while trying to guard one's own. The motives that lie behind it are always various, and most of the variety are bad because selfish. The good motive and the evil find the same method of expression, and the bias of enmity invariably makes men fasten on the worse and not the better reason. There is no intrinsic quality in a bullet to tell its recipient whether it was fired by a patriot or a pirate. The Press of Europe is an ample illustration of this statement. Warring Christians are always labelled as hypocrites by the opposing nation. It is impossible in a social order such as the present, with its complex interests, as well as through the present diplomacy, with its dark ramifications, for peoples to have a perfectly informed idea either of their own case or of that of the enemy, and the consequence is that each reads into the other motives that are base, and to this the ordinary passions of humanity lend themselves all too willingly.

But in addition to this, the method of war is wrong. There is no common denominator between force and reason; force can never prove a right, or morally justify a wrong. The rights and wrongs of any dispute remain unaltered, from the nature of the case. The

toll of blood and life is superfluous to the verdict. If right could be proved by force the tiger would often be better than a man, and therefore more moral. Yet it is with such a clumsy vindication that the nations identify God. But not only is the method of war wrong, seeing that you can never convince, though you may cow by force,—but its aftermath is terrible. We do not deny that in certain cases there is left mutual respect through the knowledge of bravery, but unless it is a bravery touched with unselfishness you have no healing residuum, and the broad fact remains that nothing is more terrible, from the point of view of soul, than the effects of impotence in the conquered who believe that they are right. It is only equalled in spiritual destructiveness by the pride of those who have been the victors, and this pride has always been an irresistible temptation among those who sought to vindicate what was right by force of arms.

We pass over the effects in those quiet centres where the future is being formed, in the unnumbered homes widowed and stricken. It is difficult to be convinced that the slayer of a father or of a son did it in love, or to see the spiritual side of an opposing country's command that led to it. The stricken homes in France in 1870 fostered the spirit of revenge for 1914 ; and the easy German conquest of that earlier time has largely helped to bring to rotten ripeness the militarist fruit of this hour.

There is usually behind war a false idea of nationality and empire ; nations are regarded as independent entities and as ends in themselves ; moral considerations, we are told, obtain only within the sphere of a

nation; national power and worldly self-interest are sufficient motives to justify the clash of nations. But just as the family exists to train us in the charities, and therefore to be a window to humanity, so does the nation, if it is to have any ethical vindication. Humanity is both greater and wider than any single nation. No national assertion is justified unless it is consistent with the good of all, and national freedom is but licence unless it makes for the freedom of all.

We have seen that the glory of war is a personal spiritual expression; we have seen that the sin of war consists in an inherent denial of individual personal worth, and that therefore from a moral and spiritual point of view war is condemned. But any solution to the problem which is thus raised must have in it that nobility and that spiritual worth which war reveals. Just as war is a higher spiritual expression than a peace which is sought for reasons of comfort, so must any solution, if it is to be adequate, reveal a spiritual progress and maintain and not deny a selfless heroism. But the solution also must be one worthy of reasonable, loving, and free souls, such as will conserve the worth of each as well as the worth of all. Can such a solution be found? The answer is, in the Cross of Christ. But it must be clearly understood that the Cross is but the expression of Jesus Christ. It is the supreme revelation of what He was and is. It is therefore not separable from His life, for in both His life and death what Jesus was and stood for finds expression, and in that expression we have the revelation of God. We affirm that when its meaning is understood we have in the Cross the principle for

the solution of the world-problem, for that problem will be solved when souls are recreated in reconciliation to God and to one another. The world is at any time what the persons in it make it. Civilization is a personal norm, expressing in its attainments and in its defects the average good and evil of human hearts and lives. Without this personal life, the world would be as useless as the worn-out moon. It is almost impossible to use the term "The Cross" to convey a definite meaning. That for which it self-evidently stands has been almost submerged by theologies which expressed the conventional standpoint of their respective times, far more clearly than its simple and eternal message, and there is no lack to-day of those legal and non-moral interpretations which are a fitting justification for an unethical respect of persons, and for the crude view of substitutionary sacrifice which war sanctions. In saying this, however, we are not denying the reality and value of vicarious suffering.

The Cross has in it the solution, for among other things it contains two assertions:

(1) The absolute value and right of the soul, and
(2) The absolute value and right of other souls.

(1) THE ABSOLUTE VALUE AND RIGHT OF THE SOUL

The Man Christ Jesus, rising above all the slaveries of life, asserted the absolute value and right of His own soul on the Cross. The mass-voices of His day left Him untouched. His only authority was a spiritual and personal conviction which He realised through fellowship with the Father and through love for His

fellows. This breathes through all He said and did. His message was a self-expression, and it had as its aim to bring others into the fellowship of the same humanity. We shall never apprehend His divinity and His uniqueness save as we realise the authority of that ideal humanity, which authority comes to us as we see that in His manhood there is the meaning of our human life, and that to enter into that relationship to God and man which He reveals is our salvation. We have no right to name the name of Christ while denying this demand. To regard as an interim ethic the moral teaching which this manhood involved and expressed, and to declare that the moral attitude of the man Christ Jesus is different from that of the risen Saviour, is not only to empty of meaning commands like "Follow Me," "Take my yoke upon you," "Learn of Me," but to postulate a Christ with contradictory moral standards. He was exalted because He was righteous, and remains righteous; He was crowned because He was humble and remains humble; He was raised because God vindicated that humanity, and in that vindication demanded that we recast the values of life, finding in humility our grandeur, in truth our freedom, and in love our might. In the Cross Jesus stood between a world-order that denied the Father, and the spiritual Kingdom of souls which affirmed Him, and dying asserted His right over against the world, to identify Himself with the Kingdom of God, and only thus could He die for the world. That He calls us individually into the same fellowship, and for the sake of the world's redemption, is the reason why He makes the oft-repeated personal challenge in the

Synoptics, "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me."

(2) THE ABSOLUTE VALUE AND RIGHT OF OTHER SOULS

He died for all, with a non-resistant yet positive love, affirming His spirit, and in that affirmation carrying love's assault to other men in a way that was otherwise impossible. He could not cause men to enter into their heritage by destroying them; he could not convince them of what was true by bodily assault; He could not show them that the soul was infinitely more valuable than the things of earthly comfort and necessity except by proving its freedom in death. He could not show us that selfishness, malice and resentment mean real defeat for spiritual beings except by the opposition of a non-resentful dying love. "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." He was victorious because He did not succumb to these ordinary human passions; His enemies smote His body, but His soul was unconquered, for He still sought them. He showed the real depth and greatness of human life, for, loving each, He loved all, and thus identified Himself with humanity. That is why He is the Saviour of the world. Unveiling the sin and lovelessness of the human heart, He revealed the righteousness and mercy of God, condemning sin that He might redeem the soul.

His victory was certain, for men have no armour against this appeal. Its meaning and motive is clear, and is not susceptible of other explanations.

His enemies could only say, " He saved others, Himself He cannot save." We have no effective weapon, in earth or heaven, against the soul that loves us regardless of what we are, and, refusing to resist the assault of the body, calls us to enter into our own heritage. When in sin we accomplish the murder of such a man, there can be only one of two results, either brutalisation, the drawing of the curtain over our vision, the hardening of the heart against love, and the loss of our freedom through selfish passion, and this is death ; or, on the other hand, the awakening to life through remorse, the entering into our heritage through penitence. There can be no new vision for us that has not in it the dead face, and we can have no garden of love without our sin against love being like a snake in the grass. That is why the gate of the City of God has over it the word " Forgiveness."

The Church has no meaning unless it be that of the fellowship of the Cross. We do not see masses, we see souls. " Mankind is all mass to the human eye, all individual to the Divine," writes Canon Mozley, and in the very writing destroys his argument for war. We only perfectly know God as expressed in the humanity of Jesus, and Jesus calls on us to look on men in the Divine way. And so it is that the Cross is our only might, for through it alone as the principle of our action can we truly express our souls, and awaken the souls of others. We also have to be divinely oblivious to enmity, and to refuse to treat any man as an enemy. In so doing we know ourselves as immortal, God, who is Love, as our Father, Jesus Christ as our Friend and Saviour, and each and all as brethren. Our patriotism

is none the less real because, asserting for our own that which is the highest, we also assert it for humanity.

No other solution is possible, for the meaning of the world is only found in the love and fellowship of God, and the world can never be truly possessed until its meaning is understood. The possessions of the world are dead dross until they become to us the symbols of the love of God, and the conditions for the expression of love and service to man.

This may be ideal, and men will cry against it, because it offers no immediate solution, but if it did it would not be true. That it is ideal is its real recommendation, and involves the fact that it is a present spiritual imperative which should govern the action both of the Church and of the individual Christian. The task before the Church is infinitely great ; it is to settle outward conditions through the re-creation of individual souls. It is to affirm that the only unity is not an outward one of legal ordering, but primarily one of spiritual love and freedom. When that comes, the outward will take on a different expression.

For this the Church of Christ exists in the world, and in the measure that she fails to understand it she fails to find her own meaning. She affirms herself when she denies expediency—the principle of man—for principle, which is the expediency of God. The Church can only find her true expression in the measure that each of her members, in the face of personal, social and political evil, acts as a member of an ideal community, and acts towards every man in a manner

consistent with his redemption. If this is called folly, we simply reply that the Cross has been both a folly and a stumbling-block to Greek and Jew, but it still remains the power of God and the wisdom of God. We are to follow Him who heard the imperative of the Cross above the cry of the crowd, and died with a sublime faith both in God and man.

We dimly see its applications to life. The very data of life may involve that many of our applications are experimental, but war has brought to light certain clear issues for the Christians of the West, and the misery is that the Church has failed. Had she been silent, penitent, living wholly to bind up the wounds of men, leaving the crucified Saviour to bear His own uninterpreted witness to the hearts of men, nothing need have been said. Had she left the individual to his freedom, instead of insisting in every nation on one particular course of action, nothing need have been said. But she has through many official pronouncements in different lands identified destruction with the Cross. In the inevitable conflict of obligations between nationalism on the one hand and the Kingdom of God on the other, she has affirmed the lower and denied the higher. She has not seen that the distinctiveness of Christianity as life consists not in dying to resist an enemy's material demand but in dying to capture an enemy's soul. She has stood for Thermopylæ but not for Calvary, and in doing so has denied the higher patriotism; for the truest glory of a nation lies in its moral and spiritual attainment, and in its manifestation to the world that the real treasures are those which moth and rust do not

corrupt and which thieves cannot steal. It is for this reason that loyalty drives us to the affirmation that the Church of the West has gone beyond her province in her confusion of principles with application, that is, in her virtual denial of personal freedom. At the present moment Christians are in sharp division all over Europe. For Europe the vision of Christ has been dimmed. The Church has asserted the temporal instead of the eternal. She has put to herself the question, "How much of our Christianity can be brought into the present situation?" and not, "What does Christianity demand in the present or any situation?" "We have crucified Christ on the Calvary of our battle-grounds."

W. Fearon Halliday.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

being a company of persons who seek, individually and corporately, to take their part in the "Ministry of Reconciliation" between man and man, class and class, nation and nation, believing all true reconciliation between men to be based upon a reconciliation between man and God.

"God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself."

"He gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

The movement which has taken shape in the formation of The Fellowship of Reconciliation, originated in the coming together of men and women belonging to various Christian Communions who are profoundly dissatisfied with the confused utterance of the Christian Churches concerning the present war and war generally. To them it appears that there has been a general failure to interpret the mind of Christ at this time, and that this failure entails a very serious menace to the future of the Kingdom of God, both in this country and throughout the world. They are persuaded that no war, however justifiable on prevailing standards, can ever be justified from the Christian standpoint.

Though they find themselves at variance with many of their fellow Christians, they desire to proclaim their conviction in a spirit of humility, honour and love, to exercise forbearance in argument, and to guard against the danger of controversial methods, believing that

they are but a few out of many, both in this land and others, who are seeking to know and act upon the truth at this time.

A group of about 130 persons who share this conviction and who are prepared to devote some time and energy towards making an effective witness to it at the present time, met at Cambridge during the last four days of 1914. Without wishing to bind themselves to any exact form of words, they recorded their general agreement on the following points :—

(1) That Love, as revealed and interpreted in the life and death of Jesus Christ, involves more than we have yet seen, that it is the only power by which evil can be overcome, and the only sufficient basis of human society.

(2) That, in order to establish a world-order based on Love, it is incumbent upon those who believe in this principle to accept it fully, both for themselves and in their relation with others, and to take the risks involved in doing so in a world which does not as yet accept it.

(3) That, therefore, as Christians, we are forbidden to wage war; and that our loyalty to our country, to humanity, to the Church Universal and to Jesus Christ our Lord and Master, calls us instead to a life-service for the enthronement of Love in personal, social, commercial and national life.

(4) That the Power, Wisdom and Love of God stretch far beyond the limits of our present experience, and that He is ever waiting to

break forth into human life in new and larger ways.

(5) That since God manifests Himself in the world through men and women, we offer ourselves to Him for His redemptive purpose, to be used by Him in whatever way He may reveal to us.

While the above principles fairly represent the views of those who met at Cambridge, and may be taken as indicating the ideals which animate the members of the Fellowship, it should be clearly stated that they are not put forward as a full and final statement, nor is it expected that only those who can accept every word in them are to be included in the Fellowship. What is desired is not a common creed but one spirit animating a living body.

General Principles of Propaganda :—

1. It will be the aim of the Fellowship to state positively and constructively the message of Reconciliation, and not spend itself in mere protest.
2. While the immediate occasion of the Fellowship is the call to make clear the Christian witness in relation to war, it is fully understood that our purpose is to contribute, where possible, in and through the Churches, to the bringing in of a new order of life in which the Christian principle shall be recognised and accepted as the basis of individual, national and international conduct.
3. It is intended that members of the Fellowship shall work out personally and on their own

lines what is involved in their membership, and there will be no attempt to stereotype any programme or method to which all will be committed.

All who feel prepared to further the aims of this movement are invited to enrol themselves as members of *The Fellowship of Reconciliation.*

The following Committee has been appointed to help in carrying forward this work :—

C. Franklin Angus.
Roderic K. Clark.
Marian E. Ellis.
Lucy Gardner.
W. Fearon Halliday.
J. St. G. Heath.
Henry T. Hodgkin.
McEwan S. Lawson.
W. E. Orchard.
Mary E. Phillips.
Richard Roberts.
A. Maude Royden.
Lilian Stevenson.

Methods Already Discussed and Generally Approved :—

(a) Meetings of smaller or larger groups, short conferences, discussions, fireside gatherings, etc., at which

(i.) Persons known to be sympathetic could pray and talk over the situation in order to receive further light, and in order the better to express their message.

(ii.) Members of the Fellowship could meet with others in order to talk over the whole question, in the light of the revealed Will of God.

(b) Public meetings, either with already existing organizations or by special arrangements.

(c) Literature, letters to the Press, etc. It is proposed that the Fellowship should put out leaflets, tracts and books, and also take steps to watch the press of the country with a view to directing the minds of men and women towards those principles for which we stand, and towards the method of their application under present conditions.

(d) The enrolment and training of a definite order of men and women who feel called to devote themselves entirely to proclaiming and working out these ideals.

(e) Prayer is the supreme method in which every one of us must take his share. Many of those who were at Cambridge resolved to devote a definite period of time each day to meditation and prayer in reference to the present situation, and the purposes with which we have entered upon this work. More particularly we felt it laid upon us to pray for a speedy, a righteous and an enduring peace, and it may be that some definite part will be given to us in working towards the fulfilment of this prayer.

All communications should be addressed to the Hon. Sec.,

LUCY GARDNER, 92, St. George's Square, S.W.

or to the Chairman,

HENRY T. HODGKIN, 15, Devonshire Street, Bishopsgate, E.C.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.*

BOOKS.

"PRUSSIANISM AND ITS DESTRUCTION." By Norman Angell. (Heinemann, 1s. net).

A re-issue of Part II. of the Great Illusion, with three new chapters on the present war.

"THE WAR AND DEMOCARCY." By various Authors. (Macmillan, 2s. net).

Gives much interesting information about modern European history and discusses the issues of the war. There is too much tendency to idealise British institutions and look upon the bad side of German affairs. But otherwise it is a useful book.

"THE WAR AND THE WAY OUT." By G. Lowes Dickenson. (Chancery Lane Press. 6d.).

Ably discusses the source of the war in the unreality of "the Governmental mind." A valuable booklet.

"ATONEMENT AND NON-RESISTANCE." By W. E. Wilson. (Headley Bros. 6d.).

"THE PRACTICE OF CHRISTIANITY." By the author of "Pro Christo et Ecclesia." (Macmillan. 4s. 6d. net).

Shows in very clear ways how far the Christian ideal would lead to a re-construction of ordinary life if those who profess to hold it really carried their beliefs into practice. A very valuable book.

* This list of books does not aim to be exhaustive of those on the subject of the war: it is rather a guide to some of those which are in line with the tenour of the book.

"CHRIST AND WAR." By William E. Wilson. (Headley Bros. 1s. net).

Examines our Lord's teaching, His idea of the Kingdom, the view of war in the Early Church, the change when the Empire adopted Christianity, the teaching of various bodies in the Middle Ages. (The Franciscan Tertiaries were forbidden to fight.) The Quaker testimony. Later chapters treat the subject from an economic standpoint.

"FRIENDS AND THE WAR." Many contributors. (Headley Bros. Paper covers, 1s. net).

Papers read at a Conference held in the autumn of 1914.

"PERSONALITY AND NATIONALITY." By Richard Roberts. (Headley Bros. Cloth 2s. net; Paper, 1s. net).

This book is a study in recent history. The author compares Modern Germany and Modern England, and discusses the question where Germany went wrong. He follows the discussion up with thoughts on how Personality affects Nationality, and Ethics our ideas of Empire.

"BLOOD AGAINST BLOOD." By A. S. Booth-Clibborn. (Headley Bros. 1s. net).

PAMPHLETS.

"THE GREAT ADVENTURE." By A. Maude Royden. A plea for disarmament. (Headley Bros. 2d.).

"THE CHURCH'S OPPORTUNITY IN THE PRESENT CRISIS. By Henry T. Hodgkin, M.A. (Headley Bros. 2d.).

"ON SERVICE." By E. S. Woods, M.A., author of "Modern Discipleship." (Headley Bros. 3d.)

"THE CHRISTIAN'S PERPLEXITY." By John E. McIntyre, M.A. (Motherwell). (Headley Bros. 2d.).

"WOMEN AND WAR." By Frances S. Hallowes. An Appeal to Women of all Nations. (Headley Bros. Paper wrapper, 2d. net).

PROBLEMS OF THE WAR. By Norman Angell. (Adult School Union. Cloth limp. 6d. net).

"THOUGHTS ON THE WAR." By A. Clutton-Brock. Reprinted from *The Times* Literary Supplement. (Methuen. 1s. net).

"FOUNDATIONS OF NATIONAL GREATNESS. By Wm. C. Braithwaite, B.A., LL.B. Suggestions for Study Circles. (Adult School Union. 3d. net).

"THE EUROPEAN WAR." By the Editor of *The Friends' Quarterly Examiner*. (Adult School Union. 2d. net).

"AMOR VINCIT OMNIA." By Lilian Stevenson. (Student Movement. 3d. net).

"WILLIAM PENN'S ESSAY TOWARDS THE PRESENT AND FUTURE PEACE OF EUROPE." Reprinted from the Original Edition. (Headley Bros. 2d.).

"ABOVE THE BATTLEFIELD." By Romain Rolland. (Friends' Peace Committee. 1d.).

"THE LOVER OF NATIONS." By Louise E. Matthaei. (Heffer. 1d.).

"A LETTER TO AN EX-PACIFIST." By Edward Smith. (Garden City Press. 1d.).

"UN AUTRE ASPECT DE LA QUESTION EUROPEENNE ET UNE SOLUTION." Henry Lambert. (Wightman, Mountain & Andrews, Ltd.). A most interesting plea from a Belgian for peace through the means of Free Trade; it shows the possibility of making a beginning for substantial peace through this means; it is strikingly free from any hostile sentiments against Germany.

"OUR LORD'S COMMAND." ½d. From Miss Dougall, Cumnor, Oxford.

"THE WAR IN EUROPE." By Dr. Salter. States strongly the position that there are only two religions, of force and of faith; that force can only be overcome by love; that the imitation of Jesus makes war impossible for the writer as he tries to picture his Lord so engaged; that the only thing to do is to do His Will, and take the consequences.

"The Society of Friends and the War." (Northern Peace Board, Leeds. 1d.).

"A Catechism of Christian Non-Resistance." By W. Evans Darby. (Peace Society. 2d.).
A catechism is a somewhat unusual form for a pamphlet in modern times, but the contents are excellent.

"The Force of Pacifism." By Edward G. Smith. (Garden City Press, Letchworth).
Points out that Pacifism is not passive.

A Quaker View of the War." By H. T. Hodgkin. (Northern Friends' Peace Board. Leeds. 1d.).

"Peace! Peace!" By H. G. Alexander. (Garden City Press. 1d.) Pleads for a fair settlement without revenge, and without crushing Germany.

"Why Great Britain Should Disarm." (National Labour Press. 1d.).
A plea for disarmament.

"Stops, Openings and Movings." (E. E. Taylor, Bannisdale, Malton. 1s. 3d. per 100.) Also other issues of the Malton leaflets.

HEADLEY BROTHERS, BISHOPSGATE, E.C.; AND ASHFORD, KENT.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

BT736.4 .C4
Christ and peace : a discussion of some

BT
736.4
C4

Christ and peace; a discussion of some fundamental issues raised by the war. Essays by J. St. George Heath [and othe Edited by Joan M. Fry. London, Headley [191-]
112p. 21cm.

Bibliography: p.109-112.

1. Peace (Theology)--Addresses, essays, tures. 2. Fellowship of Reconciliation.